DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 598 CE 044 704

AUTHOR Godsell, G.; And Others
TITLE A Report on the Industrial Relations Film "Indaba Ye Grievance." Research Finding PERS-392.
INSTITUTION Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria (South Africa).
REPORT NO ISBN-0-7969-0322-0
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 106p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Adults; Attitude Measures; Career Education; Documentaries; *Employee Attitudes; *Employer Attitudes; Employer Employee Relationship; Foreign Countries; *Grievance Procedures; *Instructional Films; *Instructional Material Evaluation; Labor Education; *Labor Relations
IDENTIFIERS *South Africa

ABSTRACT

Attitudes and reactions are reported regarding the South African film, "Indaba Ye Grievance," (produced by the Human Sciences Research Council) which was designed to show unsophisticated workers the advantages of a grievance procedure and the problem of acceptability. Chapter 1, "Background to the Film 'Indaba Ye Grievance'" (R. S. Hall), discusses film objectives and production. Chapter 2, "'Indaba Ye Grievance': Discussion of Film Realism and Its Communicative Competence" (Keyan Tomaselli), offers comments on the documentary film, discusses assumptions made on the context of the film, and reports responses of white supervisors/managers and black workers to the film. It finds that the workers endorsed the portrayal of themselves, while supervisors/managers were more skeptical of the accuracy of the situations presented. Chapter 3, "Audience Reaction to the Film" (G. Godsell), presents results of a small qualitative study to assess the kinds of impact the film had on managers and workers, to discover which issues should be covered in a companion manual, and to ascertain problem areas and possible areas of improvement. This chapter discusses use of the film for instruction on interpersonal relations, grievance procedures, and general principles of industrial relations and for management training. Chapter 4 lists possible improvements to the film. Appendixes, amounting to over one-half of the report, include the script outline, the narrative in both English and Zulu, and interview schedules. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Research Finding PERS-382

1985

ED271598

A report on the industrial relations film "Indaba Ye Grievance"

G. Godsell
R.S. Hall
K. Torrasselli

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Human Sciences Research Council

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Nasionale Instituut vir Personeelnavorsing — NIPN
National Institute for Personnel Research — NIPR

RGN-HSRC

Research Finding PERS-392

A report on the industrial relations film "Indaba Ye Grievance"

G. Godsell
R.S. Hall
K. Tomaselli

Pretoria
Human Sciences Research Council
1985

G. Godsell, Analysis of Audience Reaction, Industrial Psychologist, Johannesburg

R.S. Hall, Project Leader, Head Industrial Relations Group NIPR, Johannesburg

K. Tomaselli, Advice and Assessment, Professor and Director, Contemporary Cultural Studies Unit, University of Natal, Durban

National Institute for Personnel Research
Executive Director: DR G.K. Nelson

ISBN 0 7969 0322 0

© Human Sciences Research Council, 1985

Printed by: J.C. Insto-Print

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Dr Nelson, Executive Director, NIPR, for the opportunity for carrying out this project and for constant support. We would also like to thank Mr Davis, Executive Director, BIFSA and Mr Hattingh, Managing Director, Federated Life Insurance Assurance Company for sponsoring the production of the film.

We must also thank BIFSA Training College, Nigel, Murray and Roberts Buildings (Tvl), LTA Building (Witwatersrand) and the South African Transport Services for facilities and staff in the production of the film and the assessment of audience reaction.

We are also grateful for the co-operation of NIPR staff both for advice and suggestions during the making of the film and for assistance with the assessment of audience reaction.

Our thanks also go to the long list of other persons we have consulted in the course of this project.

CONTENTS

	Page
OPSOMMING	vii
SUMMARY	viii
CHAPTER 1 - Background to the Film Indaba Ye Grievance - R.S. Hall	1
CHAPTER 2 - Indaba Ye Grievance - Discussion of Film Realism and its Communicative Competence - K. Tomaselli	5
CHAPTER 3 - Audience Reaction to the Film - G. Godsell	18
CHAPTER 4 - Where the Film Indaba Ye Grievance could have been Improved	38
APPENDIX 1 - The List of Characters and Script	39
APPENDIX 2 - The Narrative - a) English	49
b) Zulu	61
APPENDIX 3 - Typical Film Shooting Schedule	72
APPENDIX 4 - The Structured Interview for Managers	75
APPENDIX 5 - The Structured Interview for Workers	83
APPENDIX 6 - The Group Discussions, Trainers and Workers	89
APPENDIX 7 - Title list for Film - a) English	93
b) Zulu	95

NOTE: The contribution by Professor Tomaselli reflects his own views which are not necessarily those of of HSRC.

OPSOMMING

Demokratiese denkrigtings in arbeidsbetrekkinge veronderstel 'n mate van gesofistikeerdheid onder werknemers. As 'n groot aantal ongesofistikeerde werkers basiese opleiding moet ontvang, ontstaan daar egter dikwels probleme. Media vir massa-instruksie sou baie waardevol kon wees, mits hulle aanvaarbaar sou wees vir 'n gehoor wat geneig is om sulke vorms met wantroue te bejeën. Hierdie probleem is nie net van belang op die gebied van arbeidsbetrekkinge nie, maar in baie ander velde ook.

Die film "Indaba Ye Grievance" is gemaak om vir ongesofistikeerde werkers die voordele van 'n griewe-prosedure aan te dui, maar die hoof probleem wat aangepak is, is die probleem van aanvaarbaarheid. Die metodes wat gebruik word, word in die verslag beskryf.

Om sy geslaagdheid te toets, is die film aan groepe bestuurders, opleiers en werkers getoon. Hul reaksies is ondersoek deur middel van gestruktureerde onderhoude en groepbesprekings. Werkers het of 'n Engelstalige of 'n Zoeloe-vertaling gehoor tydens die vertoning. Die taal wat gebruik is het geblyk 'n belangrike verskil te maak in die mate van begrip wat werkers agterna getoon het.

Die mees opvallende uitkoms van die ondersoek was die groot verskil tussen die waarnemings van die bestuurders en dié van die werkers. Laasgenoemde het byvoorbeeld die film as lewensgetrou beskou, terwyl lede van eersgenoemde groep gedeeltes as onrealisties bestempel het.

Op grond van die reaksies op die film, kan vir moontlike gebruiksvelde bepaal word: opleiding in interpersoonlike verhoudinge, in die gebruik van griewe-prosedures, in algemene beginsels van arbeids-betrekkinge, in die opleiding van bestuurders.

Uiteenlopende waarnemings skep 'n probleem. Dit is eenvoudig nie moontlik om 'n film te maak wat die onvoorwaardelike goedkeuring van beide bestuurders en werkers sal wegdra nie. As 'n film die werksplek vanuit die gesigspunt van die werker uitbeeld, raak die bestuur ongemaklik. As dit vanuit enige ander oogpunt gemaak word, is dit nie meer vir werkers aanvaarbaar nie. Tog is dit die bestuur wat moet besluit of so 'n film gemaak of gewys moet word, of nie.

SUMMARY

Democratic philosophies in Industrial Relations presuppose some sophistication among the workforce but the essential training is a serious problem when very large numbers are involved. Media for mass instruction would be of great assistance if acceptable to an audience inclined to regard such forms with hostility and scepticism. This is a problem of importance in many fields besides Industrial Relations.

The film "Indaba Ye Grievance" was made for showing unsophisticated workers the advantages of a grievance procedure, but it primarily addressed the problem of acceptibility. The methods used are described in the report.

To test its success the film was shown to groups of managers, trainers and workers and their reactions were obtained from either structured interviews or group discussions. The workers were shown either a version with a Zulu narrative or an English. The language used for the narrative made an important difference to understanding.

The most striking result was a great difference between the perceptions of managers and workers. For one thing the latter saw the film as highly realistic whereas some of the former did not.

From the responses four possible uses of the film are evident: instruction on interpersonal relations, on grievance procedures, on general principles of Industrial Relations and for management training.

Different perceptions create a problem. It is simply not possible to create a film that will be endorced by both managers and workers. A film that portrays the workplace as workers see it makes management uncomfortable, but workers will reject one that does not and yet it is management that must decide whether to make or show such a film.

CHAPTER 1

1. BACKGROUND TO THE FILM INDABA YE GRIEVANCE - R S HALL

The idea of the film grew out of the realisation that an immense problem existed in the field of industrial relations - the need to train the million or so black workers who have joined trade unions in recent years. Most of the unions they have joined have very slender resources both in expertise and finance and although some assistance is received from outside sources, it is rarely possibly to do more than attempt brief training courses for the tens of thousands of shop stewards and officials. The ordinary member receives very little.

This is important for it is ultimately the vote of the ordinary member that determines whether there will be industrial action and what form it will take. The ordinary black worker, however, has not grown up within an industrial relations tradition and knows very little of its structures and procedures and so sees industrial conflict in more direct terms.

Considering the vast numbers involved and the rate of recruitment, it seems impossible to train any but a small proportion of union members by the small group methods currently in use and clearly some form of mass education is required.

Of all the forms available, audio-visual has the greatest impact, although it must be followed up, if it is to have a lasting effect. Between the film and the video, the former has most of the advantages. It is cheaper (editing the latter requires very expensive equipment), can use a larger screen, has more true colours and is altogether the better product and it is easier and cheaper to copy from film to video than vice versa.

In making the film, there were three major objectives. First, it should have a strong emotional impact to improve retention. Second, it should be as realistic as possible for a worker audience to increase acceptability and rapport. The third objective, and the most important for a film of this nature was pointed out by Professor Tomaselli. If the film's message

is to penetrate workers' scepticism towards anything associated with management, it must be seen as belonging to workers in the sense that it is of their own experience and formulation.

The first two objectives it was thought could be achieved by shooting the film in a factory where the noise, dust, heat and activity would create a background of tension and if the actors were ordinary workers and managers who would play the scenes from their own experience of the workplace. The selection of the actors was to be left to the firm. This leaves a lot to chance, but the key element here is the ability of the film director to inspire untrained actors to overcome their natural fears when in front of the camera and to get across to them the precise nuances of the parts they are to play.

By good fortune, the very successful film on family planning produced by Kevin Harris was shown at the NIPR and it was clear that the style and spirit of this film was precisely that wanted for the proposed industrial relations film. Mr Harris proved willing to undertake the proposed film. Thus the project acquired the highly specialised directing skills that were necessary.

A script was prepared in outline. This consisted of two stories. In the first the tension of bad relations between a worker and supervisor built up to the drama of a strike followed by the depression and anxiety of the workers as the strike continued. In the second story, a different man starting with the a similar incident, was taken through the grievance procedure by his shop steward to a final tense scene where the manager investigated the case. The script was checked out with trade union officials in several unions and a number of IR managers. The NIPR Training Division and other NIPR staff also made valuable contributions.

At the same time a search was made for a sponsor to cover the production costs of the film amounting to R60,000. Eventually BIFSA and Federated Insurance agreed jointly to sponsor it. This necessitated some changes as the sponsors required the film to be shot at a building site and without trade union presence.

Other important changes were made after consultation with Professor Tomaselli. He pointed out that in the script the grievance procedure appeared to be a management originated procedure and therefore the film would probably be viewed with scepticism by a worker audience. If the message was to have any chance of being accepted, it would have to be more oriented towards the workers' point of view.

Once again the script was revised. This time both stories related to the same man which tightened the emotional content, and the grievance procedure was now shown to result from negotiations between management and the workers.

After some difficulty in finding a suitable site, Murray & Roberts agreed to make a site available and shooting started. Filming was quick. A week was sufficient and this included the strike which was filmed at the BIFSA Training College, Springs, to minimise disruption to building operations.

The film produced a number of surprises. First was the quality of the acting, particularly of the black workers which gave the film unexpected depth. The second was the tempo and emotional level which were slower and lower than originally conceived. This developed out of the film director's sensitivity to the behaviour of his actors.

During editing another change was made. As large parts of the film were in the vernacular, it was decided to provide a version with a background commentary in English to allow management to follow the story. It was found that the commentary by bringing out the story more clearly, enhanced the emotional impact. As a commentary in English might generate unwanted reactions a Zulu translation was used for the version to be shown to a worker audience.

The film was then shown to small groups of managers and workers and their reactions assessed by means of interviews and group discussions. The results are described in Chapter 3. In order to minimise possible bias this analysis of audience reaction was carried out by a psychologist who was not on the NIPR staff and had nothing to do with the making of the film.

This research has been the basis of a guide on group discussions after a showing of the film in order to reinforce its message. The research has also shown that the approach adopted has been successful in making a very strong impression on worker audiences.

CHAPTER 2

2. INDABA YE GRIEVANCE: DISCUSSION OF FILM REALISM AND ITS COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE - KEYAN TOMASELLI

2.1 Some Comments on Documentary Film

Documentary film is often thought to offer realistic representations of an objective reality. Things, people and locations are easily recognisable: the images are **realistic.** This 'impression of reality' is reinforced by means of invisible editing where viewers are not aware of the time, space and narrative dislocations of the pro-filmic event (1), the invisible collapse of time and space in the diegesis (2) and the numerous conventions which construct a spurious continuity and which viewers come to take for granted over time. In conventional films, all these significatory devices have the effect of mystifying the hidden processes which make up the conditions of social, economic and political life.

Documentary film does not communicate the same message to all viewers. Differences in interpretation will occur in terms of culture (our ways of making sense and coping with situations), class (our position in the relations of production - workers, supervisors/managers or owners) and level of visual literacy (the extent to which people have been exposed to and can interpret visual media).

Major differences in interpretation with regard to a labour relations film made for the Chamber of Mines will provide a good example of my introductory comments on documentary, above. **A World of Difference** so totally misrepresented the social psychology and culture of mineworkers that the film exacerbated the difficult management-labour relations to the extent that the film had to be withdrawn from circuit.

The basic problem with **A World of Difference** stemmed largely from the unconscious ideololgical and cultural assumptions of the scriptwriter, film makers and sponsor. Apart from a racist authoritarian representation of black workers whose own motivations and behaviour were not understood by the film makers, there were problems of cinematic coding. The highly conventional documentary codes used by the film makers automatically located white supervisors and management as 'superior' to black miners. In one scene, for example, a low angle shot of white miners approaching sitting black miners makes the whites dominant in the frame, and the blacks sullen and lacking in respect: the image is one of confrontation with whites ascendant. This hierarchy has been made to appear 'natural' (i.e. given the force of objective reality) in a myriad of state propaganda and 'information' films where white audiences are concerned. While the film makers took this formalist and technicist set of signs and codes for granted, the camera angles, framing and movement, together with the editing style, music and effects, totally alienated the black mineworkers whose class and work experiences led them to reject the view of themselves as presented to themselves by white film makers and mine owners. The latter had not bothered to question their **own** idiosyncratic class, race and cultural stereotypes of their black employees. In other words, images that seemed natural and the common sense way of seeing things to the makers of the film, were interpreted as propaganda and a further not so subtle attempt by management to persuade the black miners to consent to their own conditions of subordination and continued exploitation. The camera communicated this white arrogance through a thoughtless use of visual form and actor performance.

While conventional coding may work in films **about** industrial plants or construction sites, they can be counter-productive where industrial and human relationships are the subject, as at least one class - usually the workers - feel that they have been deliberately misrepresented. The codes used by the

cameraman, director and editor have their own hidden ideological content. This content derives from their own class positions (mainly middle class) and is present in their thoughts, decisions and the way that they go about production. Though the film makers may think they have done 'a good job' in terms of the aesthetics of documentary and technicalities of film making, they often simply infuriate the target audiences. The very title, **A World of Difference**, for example, encodes racist assumptions, while the way in which the film communicated management's concern about inappropriate black-white labour relations had the unintended effect of reaffirming to the black miners the insensitivity, and insincerity of mining management. While miscommunication of this sort is never the intention of a film's sponsors, it is very often the **effect** on target audiences. It should not be thought that because blacks have less opportunity of seeing films or that they come from mainly oral (as opposed to visual) cultures, that they are unable to identify and decode the dominant ideological elements encoded in film texts.

The point I am making here is that films are interpreted differently by viewers depending on their positions in the relations of production. To put it differently, the same signs, codes and representations in film are not automatically realistic or taken for granted by everybody. Dominant and conventional film codes which come across as the natural common sense way of seeing things to supervisors/management on the one hand, may be totally rejected as propagandistic by workers. The crucial point is that **neither interpretation is necessarily wrong.** This observation is borne out in the NIPR group responses to **Indaba Ye Grievance**, where none of the white supervisors/managers identified with any of the black characters. Most identified with the white supervisors and managers, even the 'bad' supervisor, Van Wyk. In contrast, most of the black labourers identified with Lucas.

Signs, codes and representations have a history, and the history of each class is perceived differently by each class. It is probably impossible to make a film that is decoded in the same way by both workers and supervisors/management. Particular films represent particular points of view: they must thus be seen in those terms. Films can only be understood through an understanding of their styles. Understanding thus involves penetrating the historical form of these signs, codes, styles and representations. Film makers thus have an ethical duty to be aware of whose interests they, and the cinematic codes they adopt, are serving. Beyond this, they need to understand the ideological connotations of such codes. In **A World of Difference**, for example, the codes used worked in nobody's interest as they exacerbated racial tensions rather than ameliorating them.

2.2 Signs, Coding and "Indaba Ye Grievance"

As far as **Indaba Ye Grievance** is concerned, we did not want to repeat the mistakes and affirm the dominant ideological connotations of previous films made on labour relations in South Africa. The target audience was identified as black construction workers. We thus set out to identify the cinematic signs, codes and representations which would connect with the common sense perceptions of the workers' everyday conditions of existence. The sponsors and film crew being white, it was necessary to assure the black workers of their integrity. To do this we not only had to present labour-management conflicts from the workers' point of view, but we had to encode signs and codes which derived from their own class and workplace experiences. These experiences are, of course, very different to the experiences of supervisor/managers and owners. The fact that many of the managers who commented on the film felt that it should **not** be shown to the workers, while the group of workers felt that the film was 'realistic', is a strong indication that the film makers were successful in their intentions. I will develop this point later.

2.3 Assumptions Made on the Context of the Film

A number of assumptions were made at the script stage which were designed to articulate worker concerns. Many of these concerns, which are taken for granted by workers, are seen in a totally different light by management. This is reflected in the Summary of Responses written by G. Godsell. Briefly, our assumptions were:

1. Labour-management conflict is inevitable in the capitalist system. Blacks know this, but the mainly white supervisor/management class tends to pretend that conflict is only caused by the idiosyncratic, destructive and stupid behaviour of the workers who are egged on by 'agitators'. This attitude is exemplified in the responses of some of the white supervisors/managers who took part in the group discussion on the film. Although trade unionism was not mentioned in the film, this form of negotiation was regarded with suspicion. Because of the ongoing nature of industrial conflict, the film takes for granted the inevitable implementation of some form of grievance procedure. The film set out to show that the grievance procedure is more than just an ad hoc arrangement to resolve personal conflicts between supervisors and workers.

2. The grievance procedure was shown to be the result of worker struggles in the past, rather than something benevolently provided by whites who now want to be nice to their employees. Trade unionism and grievance procedures arise because of asymmetrical power relationships in the workplace. Supervisors and managers are not neutral. That they are aligned with their employers is validated by their responses to the film. It is management which fires workers, which underpays them, which docks their pay: they are objectified as 'the enemy'. The grievance procedure and trade unionism is a

way of negotiating **peacefully** with this 'enemy'. They are legitimate and necessary elements of **any** economic system. Where prior to publication of the Wiehan Report, trade unions were objectified by the government - and many businesses - as 'communist', they have since been officially accepted as a fundamental part of South African employment practices. We thus attributed a positive image to disaffected workers, rather than the impudent characterisations so aften seen in other labour relations films. The workers representative, for example, is shown to be on the side of the dismissed worker, not the lackey of management.

3. The film set out to convince the workers that they should work within the structures that they themselves have precipitated: that industrial conflict is ongoing and that new and better procedures need to be evolved. As the film shows, this can only be done by the cooperation of management and labour.

4. The use of counter-ideological cinematic coding played a crucial role in communicating with worker viewers and establishing a realism with which they could identify. **Indaba Ye Grievance** questioned the conventional form of documentary and adopted the more appropriate **cinema verite** style which gives the image a sense of immediacy, of actuality and spontaneity. Conventional documentary was considered too formal: it gives the appearance of set ups, of contrivances, of authority. The signs and codes used (singing, chanting, the shouting of 'amandla', fists punching the air, and so on) are derived from icons, indexes and symbols that have become vogue in trade union, popular black and non-racial community, church, civic, student and similar organisations around the country in recent years. These gestures, slogans, songs and ways of responding and encountering social conflict have been popularised in

pamphlets, posters, leaflets by the trade union and community press, on other films and videos made about unions such as **Fosatu:Building Worker Unity**, UDF meetings and even on SABC-TV. This includes TV2/3 where until the government banned cameras from 'unrest' areas in early November 1985, showed more footage of disturbances than did the TV1. The use of counter-ideological cinematic codes appears to be successful. Black respondents stated that the film "shows exactly what happens in the real situation".

5. The film works at the level of docu-drama, dramatizing common real-life situations. Drama implies conflict. Conflict requires a protagonist and an antagonist. These are represented by the fired black worker and the white supervisor who fires him. Once the conflict is set up, narrative conventions require that the conflict is resolved.

2.4 Responses to the Film

It was probably the use of counter-ideological signs and codes in the film described in point 4, above, that disturbed the white supervisors/managers and led them to think that the film should not be screened to the black workers. The images in the film were powerful and made to seem natural in the context of supposed worker militancy. Worse still, from the point of view of the supervisor/managers, was the unity of the workers portrayed in scenes of worker discontent, the lock-outs and attempts by white management to negotiate through fences with the aid of a loud hailer with, to them, the faceless mass of workers. The camera in this case was behind the whites on the site, thus providing the black workers on the other side of the fence an idea of how whites see them in this kind of situation. While the camera locates whites dominantly in the frame, it simultaneously shows them to be helpless victims of their ideological response. They haved no-one to negotiate

with; they are unable to crack the unity of the workforce by appealing to them as individuals to return to work. Had the director ignored this kind of imagery, and presented a more palatable image of whites in control (as opposed to just visually dominant), he would have lost contact with black viewers. Now, this is a very different class response to that of whites who tend to react to situations in an indivudal way, seeing conflict as a temporary disruption that can be resolved through individual action. At least one supervisor seems to have realised that communal responses are valid: "Workers are forced to stick together because of their lifestyle". (Some workers responded individualistically even after seeing the film suggesting that they would quit after they had discussed the matter with the works committee. These respondents might have felt that their impaired dignity was not sufficiently redressed by the grievance procedure). The grievance procedure - as with trade unionism - can only work through mobilising the threat of labour power to place pressure on management. This is also no doubt disturbing for white supervisor-managers who have had total power in the past.

While the signs, codes, songs and slogans captured on the film are highly sympathetic to the workers, management is not entirely negatively portrayed. Indeed they are shown to have resolved the matter in terms of their interests. This is shown by means of two elements: first, is the fact that the workers accept the decisions of management and workings of the grievance procedure; second, while the worker is suspended, the white supervisor is not; neither is he reprimanded in front of his colleagues as was the worker. Judging from the worker response to the film, the film treatment is probably accurate in this **bias**, where the black worker is nearly always treated **differently** to white supervisors in labour relations conflicts. One respondent stated, for example, that there is no question of disciplinary measures being taken against a supervisor beyond "if the supervisor is at fault he must be told about it".

The two social practices shown to 'win' are workers on the one hand, and management on the other. The supervisors are in the middle. In **Indaba Ye Grievance** one **individual** supervisor 'loses', while one is commended for his decent supervisory practices. The 'negative' impression that might have been identified by the white supervisor/management respondents is thus cancelled through the resolution of the conflict.

A problem with the ending of the film from the point of view of the workers is that it tends to suggest that the conflict arose from the negative personal attributes of indivdual supervisors, that it is not necessarily attributable to structural conditions operative both within the construction industry's labour management practices and the apartheid social formation as a whole. While the film takes conflict for granted, it does not contextualise this within more intractable politico-economic policies of the South African state and the collusion of industry with these practices except very briefly at the beginning of the film. In view of this, the film is but a short term intervention in legitimating acceptable procedures to resolve industry-specific labour--management conflicts within the larger context of socio-political change in South Africa. Under these circumstances, the film **cannot** be interpreted as a revolutionary document which should not be shown to the workers. It represents but one rung in the ladder towards a better development of labour relations. In this the film works at a dual level of reception: first, it shows black workers that white-dominated management should be seen to be sincere in its attempts to work out methods for resolving industrial conflict, and; second, it communicates to white supervisors and management the workers perceptions of industrial relations.

Judging from the supervisor and worker group responses, it appears that the workers endorsed the portrayal of themselves in the film, whereas supervisors and management were more sceptical of the accuracy of the situations presented. This

contradiction is class-based and works on the assumption that management has the only correct view of things, and that if workers are shown 'alternative' interpretations of themselves that they will then emulate what management considers to be the 'wrong' responses and industrial practices. The workers are, after all, the final arbitors of their representation in this film and nothing managers do, say or think will change the contiguous interpretation of the workers who are able to discern connections between what they perceive going on in the workplace and what is represented in the film. For them, the film is an accurate portrayal of their perception of reality while for the white supervisors/managers it is a metaphor disconnected from actual conditions in the workplace. The latter respondents thus interpreted the film as providing **models** for potentially dissident behaviour ('giving them ideas', 'putting a weapon into the hands of the ill-informed'), affecting not only their authority (the "labour force might feel that management can be manipulated" ... "they will think they can just get reinstated"). This negative interpretation of how supervisors and managers thought black workers might respond to the film must be connected to their suspicion of trade unions. Again, supervisors and management seem hostile to any notion that work grievances arise directly out of deeper structural conditions. One wrote that "holding meetings in hostels can only happen if **infiltrated** by trade unionism" (my emphasis): another states: "Management should be able to settle grievances without encouraging trade union approach, which will cause more problems". For whom, we need to ask. If this is seen by its sponsors to merely offer models for dissent, and the film is kept from black viewers, then the entire project will come to nothing more than an expensive psychological exercise in the study of the class-based viewer dialectics of film perception.

One must accept the supervisors/managers' comments that the film is biased against the white supervisor. The film could have been made in no other way if the director was to retain

the confidence and attention of the black worker-viewers. Had the director tried to be 'objective' - giving both workers and supervisor a fair deal - the film would undoubtedly have failed. As mentioned above, to make the film convincing to the black workers, the film **has** to portray events from their point of view. Had the film portrayed events from the supervisor's perspective, the workers may have seen the film as yet another attempt to persuade them into accepting their subordination. They would not then see the grievance procedure as an element to negotiate conflict, but merely as another tool of white domination.

Though the film comes out on the side of the workers, it's identification with the black character is muted, indeed subtly underplayed. The representation of hostel life and the living conditions of migrant workers seems to have elicited a sympathetic response from a number of superivsors and managers, for example: "I saw workers as human - they are not usually portrayed like this". Despite the revelation of this new element of 'humaneness', the white supervisors/managers remained uneasy at the prospect of this film being shown to black workers. The reasons for this are no doubt deeply etched into the racist assumptions on which the South African relations of production have been based. To show workers that their supervisors and managers now view them as human beings rather than "certain forms of labour" (3) must be very unsettling.

The film indicts one supervisor only, an aggressive man who is incompetent in his job. Objections from supervisors/management about his foul language is simply an embarrassed class response to actual behaviour and is nothing more than a moral fallback to excuse what they know to be insulting behaviour. As a number of workers put it: 'bad language is a characteristic of a bad supervisor'. The film treatment of the offending supervisor is **not** metonymical for black viewers:

that is, his indictment by workers and management in no way suggests that **all** supervisors are seen to be guilty of insulting and unacceptable behaviour. The narration is clear - simplistically so - there are 'good' supervisors and incompetent supervisors. If supervisors in general have complained about the treatment of Van Wyk on the screen - seeing him as representing **all** supervisors - then perhaps the cap fits and the film does indeed have an important role to play in industrial relations. As the worker-respondents expressed it, 'the film would be particularly useful in teaching supervisors how to supervise properly'. The supervisors must be made to understand that whether or not they behave like Van Wyk, **that is the way the workers see them**. They cannot wish this perception away by not showing them the film. The challenge for the supervisors is to change this 'erroneous' perception by altering the way they behave and interact with the workers on site and through the acceptance of conflict-resolution procedures such as the grievance procedure as a protection of both worker and employee.

2.5 Conclusion

The film makers are always caught in the middle of opinions and conflicts generated by such productions. If they present images that are unsettling to management (but acceptable to workers), they are accused of 'bias' (irrespective of the original brief supplied by the sponsor). If they present images unsettling to workers (but initially acceptable to management), once the problems become evident, the film makers are accused of 'not knowing their job'.

Within these contradictory responses the film maker has to tread the path of credibility and integrity as far as his audiences are concerned. He wants to ensure that he is not 'making propaganda' for one side or the others, but is **facilitating** processes whereby black workers - who were the original target of the film - are provided access to make

their statements on film to management. If these statements are not acceptable to management, then they should not have commissioned the film in the first place. They need to look to their own motives and intentions, and what they really hoped to achieve. In this case, there is ample evidence to suggest that the film has done its job.

Indaba Ye Grievance operates off a theoretical base (both cinematic and in terms of industrial relations). A comparison of my original comments on the first draft of the script with the comments made by the two groups on the resulting film suggest a close fit between theory and practice. My recommendation is that this film be used to its fullest extent and that further research be conducted by the NIPR on developing a battery of films aimed at supervisors/managers and owners as well as workers. Each of these could benefit from a viewing of films made for the other. Maybe then viewers drawn from different levels of the production process will begin to understand the very different perceptions that different people have about the same things. This, after all, is what is really being negotiated.

Notes

1. The pro-filmic event describes the events and objects that appear in front of the camera prior to filmitization.

2. Diegisis refers to the ongoing 'story' irrespective of how much of the narrative is actually shown on-screen.

3. This landmark phrase was used by Verwoerd in the **Senate Debates** of the Union of South Africa, Second Session, 7-11 June, 1954, Cols. 595-622 and was to form the basis of the apartheid system.

CHAPTER 3

3. AUDIENCE REACTION TO THE FILM - G. GODSELL

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Nature of the study

The assessment which follows is not a full-scale research project, although it is hoped that such a project will eventually be carried out. It is a small qualitative study, carried out to assess what kinds of impact the film made on some managers and workers. Secondary aims of this study were to discover which issues should be covered in a manual to accompany the film, and to ascertain problem areas and possible areas of improvement in subsequent films.

3.1.2 Subjects

Worker subjects were obtained from the BIFSA training centre at Nigel, and were employees of a number of different organisations. It was initially hoped to involve workers from different building sites in the assessment project, but this was not possible. Interviews were conducted with 16 workers, before and after viewing of the film. Half of these workers saw the film with an English, and the other half with a Zulu commentary. An additional 16 workers were involved in group discussions, again half seeing the English version and the other half the Zulu version. Nine managers and supervisors were interviewed, before and after seeing the film. Eight BIFSA trainers participated in a group discussion after seeing the film. As workers and managers came from different organisations their responses do not relate to the same building sites.

3.1.3 Procedure

Respondents were individually interviewed before the film, to explain the purpose of the study, and ascertain their knowledge of IR procedures, views on good supervisory procedure and methods of dealing with personal problems on a building site. After seeing the film, respondents were asked about their attitude to the film, its realism, its usefulness, possible impact, and unsatisfactory aspects. For the worker respondents, specific questions relating to individual and group handling of situations were repeated before and after the film.

Responses were recorded in the language they were made in but those in the vernacular were subsequently translated into English. Subjects were interviewed by NIPR staff of the same race.

Respondents who were involved in group discussions were not interviewed before the film. Group discussions were recorded on tape, with the permission of participants, and an observer who took notes. The group leader, with the aid of the tape recording, drew up one summary of proceedings, the observer another. To save both time and cost the tapes were not transcribed.

3.2 Managers' General Impressions of the Film

3.2.1 The Film's Realism

There was a division of opinion among managers. Some felt that the film was unrealistic, because some of the situations portrayed do not happen any more. They pointed out that supervisors no longer have the power to summarily fire workers, and that management requires written warnings, documentation, etc. They made comments such as "all places have representatives now - appointing representatives is no

longer an issue" "There are no more assaults nowadays" "Today a worker will not fight, he will go to the works committee". One respondent, however, felt that the film depicted "what would only be happening in two or three years' time" - showing "the first site in South Africa which has a council office". This contrasts strongly with the emphatic worker endorsement of the reality in the film. Several managers, however, agreed with the reality of the film, making comments such as "happens all the time", "I could identify with all the situations" and "such incidents have occurred on building sites where I worked".

3.2.2 Managers' comments on who should see the Film

There seemed to be general agreement that the showing of the film should be limited to management or supervisory staff. Some conflicts within individual managers can be detected. One respondent who was emphatic that "workers do not protest against supervisors in this fashion - warnings must be given" said in response to a later question "Sam had no option but to hit, who would have listened to him?". This may express a conflict between training in IR procedures and perception of what actually happens. Another conflict can be observed on whether or not the film should be shown to workers. One respondent said he thought the film was true to life because "you can see the problems from both sides". When questioned as to why he still felt that the film should be limited to managers and supervisors, he replied "now you've stumped me. It's just that I feel it might give them ideas, and we've got the procedures anyway". No respondent gave a clear reason as to why the film should be restracted, but clearly the thought of workers seeing the film generated a great deal of unease. "If shown to the wrong audiences it could put a weapon in the hands of the ill-informed". It is probable that the weapon referred to is the strike portrayed in the film, which would cause unease, allied perhaps to the workers' meetings and the clenched fists, "singing etc. might incense people". Managers recognise that any form of worker unity is likely to make

their work more difficult in the long run. Misuse of the grievance procedure is mentioned by a couple of respondents: "workforce may be encouraged to report every grievance", "labour force might feel that management can be manipulated", "they will think they can just get reinstated".

Although stressing that it should only be shown to management and supervisors, some respondents felt that the film's impact on these people might be limited by apparent bias: "Managers could ignore this film because of a feeling that management had not been given a fair hearing in it". "Mense sal sê die wit baas is altyd verkeerd".

3.2.3 What Managers felt could be learnt from the Film

3.2.3.1 About the other side

When asked about what people might learn from the film, answers ranged from practical work improvements to general living conditions of workers. Many respondents commented on the importance of understanding the problems experienced by migrants and hostel-dwellers. "I saw workers as human - they are not usually portrayed like this" "Workers have far to travel and must not work late" "Workers are forced to stick together because of their lifestyle". One man commented simply that seeing the way the workers lived in the film made him "skoon hartseer". Others commented that they had been reminded of the fact that workers' experiences outside of working hours could affect their work performance.

3.2.3.2 About behaviour

Respondents felt that both blacks and whites could learn from the film. "Blacks will learn to ask if they don't understand things" "Will teach whites to give clear and correct instructions to prevent trouble". Some felt that the film

---

* Supervisor who was disliked because of his behaviour

emphasised the need for better training "if the Van Wyks* are taught, this will not happen". Although some respondents felt that the film would be most useful in showing supervisors how not to behave, one replied "I was taught a lot. One must be able to work with colleagues, superiors, subordinates; as supervisor, one must be capable of establishing a trust relationship, one must learn to exercise patience, one must provide workers with correct, clear instructions to prevent conflict arising".

3.2.3.3 About IR Procedures

Dealing with IR procedures, respondents seemed to fall into three groups : those who felt that their companies already had more comprehensive IR procedures than depicted in the film, and so they had learnt nothing; those who felt that the film might be useful in reinforcing the importance of existing procedures, and those who felt that the film showed the need for developing and implementing IR procedures. A separate group consisted of those who did not refer to specific procedures, but said that the film had made them aware of the need for discussion, negotiation, and "talking things through tactfully", "people talking together is important for the firm".

Typical of the first group were respondents who wrote "too simplistic to be useful for experienced men" "I learned nothing new because my company has straightforward rules and procedures" "much better communication procedures exist in our firm than were shown in the film". The second group made comments such as "IR procedures and steps were well demonstrated" "Film strong enough to reinforce liaison between management and workers" "Film reinforces the importance of grievance procedures, grievances should be handled properly". A respondent who fell into the third group wrote: "We have no grievance procedure in our own company. The system would help vastly, to assist employee and supervisor" "I saw that worker representation is important and valuable".

3.2.4 Perception of the Film Coloured by Attitude and Experience

Several respondents commented on the role of trade unions in the film. This is particularly significant, as the film was carefully and explicitly constructed around the concept of works committees rather than trade unions, in accordance with instructions from the sponsor. Yet one respondent wrote: "the message of this film to the black worker is the power of the trade union". Another wrote "holding meetings in hostels can only happen if infiltrated by trade union". "Management should be able to settle grievances without encouraging trade union approach, which will cause more problems".

This emphasises the fact that viewers do not see the film in a vacuum. They bring to their viewing aspects of their own environment. These may be concrete - their attitude is affected by the existence or otherwise of grievance procedures on their own building site. Or it may be more abstract - their own attitude to trade unions causes a projection of trade union activity onto the film. Whatever lessons have been learned from the film will again be taken back into, and modified by, both the work and the social environment. As one respondent points out: "The film will have a positive effect, but it will be eroded with time. In order for the effect to remain vivid, there would be a need for the viewers to become actively involved in similar situations".

3.2.5 Managers' Rapport with the Film

Some of the respondents felt that they could identify with characters in the film, others that they could not. People who did identify, identified themselves with Rautenbach, Van Wyk, and the contracts manager.

3.3 Interviews with workers

3.3.1 Introduction

In the interviews with workers, some identical questions were presented both before and after viewing the film, to detect changes the film might have brought about in understanding or attitude, although before-and-after responses can only provide the most approximate indication of such changes. It is also impossible to speculate on whether a changed response indicates a potential change in behaviour. Such a change may indicate a change in understanding, it may be due to the subject's boredom with having to deal with the same question twice, or it may reflect a subject's changed assessment of the socially desirable answer. Responses seemed to change more in those viewers who had seen the version with Zulu narration. In such a small sample, this may be due to chance, or it may be related to the fact that these viewers seemed to understand the film better than their counterparts who saw the version with an English narration. Percentage changes are not quoted because of the small number of subjects.

3.3.2 Workers' Responses to the Film with the Zulu Narration

During the group discussion, the group which saw the English narration version admitted to difficulty with the langauage, and with understanding what was going on. No such difficulty was reported by those who viewed the film with the Zulu narration. The responses obtained from the two groups of viewers are therefore analysed separately.

3.3.2.1 Changes in Responses between Before seeing the Film and Afterwards

i) On the Handling of Grievances : Worker Action (Q1, Q2)

The major change that occurs appears to relate to use of

worker representatives, and discussion with management, rather than the use of grievance procedures per se. No mention was made by any worker in this group of the use of a grievance procedure, either before or after seeing the film, possibly because grievance procedures were actually unfamiliar to this group. The role played by Lucas clearly had some impact, as after viewing the film, some respondents suggested using a person like Lucas to solve both individual and group grievances. Overall, however, viewing the film did not seem to bring about much change in responses.

Answering questions on how to deal with individual and group grievances, some of the post-film responses suggest the use of worker representatives, a response which did not occur before seeing the film, e.g. "Tell someone like Lucas, and he can represent me" "I can report to the person who can report the matter to my management". Discussing the issue with superiors also appears after the film: "They can boycott their work" changes to "they must discuss their problems", and "Will leave the job and look for a better place" becomes "I will go to my manager". In regard to this last response, it is noteworthy how often quitting appears as a response to a difficulty, both before and after seeing the film: "I can resign after reporting at the office". "If accused falsely, the best thing is to quit the job" "Will leave the job and look for a better place". The best solution to be hoped for is a transfer to another supervisor. There is no question of disciplinary measures being taken against a supervisor beyond "if the supervisor is at fault he must be told about it", no matter who is in the wrong.

ii) <u>On the Handling of Interpersonal Relations: Workers' Expectations of Management (Q5, Q6)</u>

Answering the questions of what actions management should take to deal with supervisors' relations with workers and with strikes, some change towards increased consultation and use of

representatives is noted, although many responses remain the same. After viewing the film, some respondents favoured meetings and discussion to solve their problems. "Consultation is the best medicine" "Call a meeting to discuss our grievances". One of the most striking examples of change is: "Management should just terminate our training and contracts of employment" which becomes after viewing the film "consultation with worker representation is the best thing to do". After seeing the film, workers were asked to distinguish between how management should behave, and how respondents thought they would behave. Sharp differences appear here. Some respondents saw a marked contrast between what should happen (consultation) and what did happen (dismissal). One respondent felt that strikes should be solved by Government intervention: "Government can discuss the matter to end the strike to arrive at an agreement. They can do anything else that suits them because they are bosses". One response, after citing the desirability of the use of consultation, is "Generally, management just dismisses employees without trying to solve problems" "What I have seen happen is that management instead dismisses workers before asking reasons for strike". Comparing this with the emphasis by management respondents on due procedures, there is clearly a difference between management and worker perception of reality.

iii) Workers' views on Good and Bad Supervisors (Q3)

No marked before and after differences appear in the descriptions of good and bad supervisor behaviour. Because it was thought that the language spoken by supervisors in the film might be an issue, subjects were asked specifically whether age, experience, language, race, and ability to speak the vernacular characterised differences between good and bad supervisors. Some respondents regarded all of these factors as irrelevant. Others commented on both age and language as being important. Young supervisors and Afrikaans-speaking supervisors were regarded as bad. These distinctions were

drawn before seeing the film. In no instance was the language group of a supervisor related to bad supervision after the film, where this had not occurred before the film. The conclusion that may be drawn from this is, that the portrayal of the bad supervisor as Afrikaans-speaking fitted in with the preconceptions of some of the viewers, and may therefore have contributed towards the realism of the film.

On the issue of bad language: some of the managers expressed their disapproval of the bad language in the film, and felt that it was "unnecessary" "exaggerated" and "would not be tolerated". No worker expressed this view. Several workers cited "bad language" as a characteristic of a bad supervisor. Workers also listed "likes dismissing people" "dismisses for no reason" as characteristics of a bad supervisor, which again contrasts with the view expressed by some managers that supervisors no longer have the power to dismiss without written warnings.

Generally, the portrait of a good supervisor was of a person who is patient, sympathetic, communicates well, handles people well, understands the work himself, and issues clear instructions. The only before-and-after change was a slight increase in emphasis on the good supervisor giving clear instructions.

A bad supervisor was described as one who could not communicate, always shouted, never listened to his workers, dismissed workers instead of teaching or correcting them, and did not know his work.

3.3.2.2 Workers' General Impressions of the Film

i) <u>The Film's Realism</u>

The film was generally regarded as a good film which "shows exactly what happens in the real situation". Asked for their

general impressions, several workers commented on what they had learned from the film. "I will remember how to solve my grievance with my supervisor". Specific aspects of the grievance procedure were commented on "I liked the part where even the foreman who was at fault was given the grievance form to present to management". No worker felt that the film as a whole was unrealistic "I've seen these things happen. Especially where Van Wyk clashes with a worker and they stand together". "I definitely feel that this film is realistic e.g. behaviour of supervisor Van Wyk; hostel life,; handling of strikes - especially presence of dogs". One respondent felt that a note of unreality had been introduced by "the scene where Sam was fired, and all the other workers came to him to ask the reason for his dismissal: that was unreal".

ii) Rapport

The only person with whom some of the workers felt they could identify was Lucas. Others felt they could not identify with anyone.

iii) What could be Learnt from the Film

Asked about the effect if the film was shown at work, and what they had learned, respondents agreed that seeing the film would be helpful, to workers, supervisors and management, "They will learn something from the film. Because most of them don't know what to do if one is fired. Nobody knows Lucas' role" "They can learn a lot. They will be told how to solve their problems" "will teach them what steps to take if there is trouble in the work situation". The lack of specificity may be due to a fault in the phrasing of the questions, or to a lack of specific knowledge having been conveyed in the film. One or two commented on the importance of worker unity, and also of harmony in the workplace. Some felt that the film would be particularly useful in teaching supervisors how to supervise properly.

3.3.3 Workers' Reponses to the Film with the English Narration

3.3.3.1 Main Impressions

As mentioned earlier this version was not as well understood as the Zulu version. Consequently the action seemed to dominate viewers' impressions. Three issues seem to have made a particular impact on this group of workers. One is the unity of the workers in the film: "The film showed a very strong unity among workers" "Workers do not leave the whites to mistreat a black" "The workforce demonstrated that if you are united you will be able to solve your problem" "The film will teach workers about a good relationship among all workers - everything can be done if workers are united. "I've realised that if one worker makes a mistake the others should stand with him." The second issue which workers reacted to was Sam's reinstatement: "I will remember the reinstatement of Sam and the jubilation which followed" "In the film we see that one can be reinstated because of the committee" "The reinstatement of Sam would have surprised the workers, because that is something very unusual".

The third issue was the strike. Two explanations for this present themselves. One is that, like the managers who saw references to trade unionism in the film, the workers are projecting their own preoccupations and preconceptions on to the film. The second is that, not understanding the dialogue, the most visually striking elements of the film have maximum impact.

Some workers reacted negatively: "I did not like this film because it ended in strike which was not good for the company. The only good thing is that at the very end Sam was reinstated". "The strike would not be liked by the majority of people because it generally results in loss of employment". Others thought the film showed the strike as a useful tool for workers to achieve their end. "This film helps the people,

with knowledge how to help themselves at work. When Sam was dismissed they all went on strike to get management to talk to them". "I will remember workers striking for a good cause and helping one another".

3.3.3.2 The Film's Realism

Generally, the film was viewed as being both helpful and realistic. "The way Van Wyk handled Sam is something that happens every day in industry". "The place where Sam was setting a column was real". "It was a true reflection of work behaviour and gives supervisors advice on how to handle their people". One aspect was regarded as unrealistic by one respondent "management does not usually solve a strike the way this one did".

3.3.3.3 What Could be Learnt from the Film

It was felt that the film would be helpful to supervisors, workers, and management. "Shows works committee representative how to go about his job when someone has a grievance". "The film should be shown to supervisors to make them aware of the consequences of their bad attitude to workers". "There is a good relationship between management and workers. If there was more of such talking together, things can be smooth in industry". "This film will help me in future, what steps to take". More practical issues were also mentioned: "I've learned how workers who are carpenters should do their work". "If a supervisor provokes me, I shouldn't fight with him".

The term "grievance procedure" was never specifically mentioned after viewing the film, nor was there any understanding of a series of steps or procedure to be followed in resolving a grievance apparent. Some reference was made to works committees, and the role of general management-worker discussions.

3.4 Summary of the Group Discussions

3.4.1 Introduction

In order to allow responses which had not been covered in the structured interviews to surface, group discussions were held with three groups immediately after seeing the film. The groups were all from the BIFSA Training Centre and consisted of 8 trainers and 8 workers who were shown the English version, and another 8 workers who saw the Zulu version.

3.4.2 Trainers' Responses

Participants in group discussions seemed, by and large, to make the same points as those made in interviews with managers. The trainers described Van Wyk's behaviour as unrealistic: "Hy was te sleg om waar te wees", but at a later stage in the discussion they conceded that he was probably typical of a type of supervisor still to be found on site.

As with some of the managers interviewed, some expressed a fear that the film might inspire black workers to unrest, or lead them to believe that they could retaliate against supervision and "get away with it". On the positive side, it was felt that workers would be made aware of the value of negotiation as opposed to striking.

The circumstances of the migrant worker were felt to have been successfully portrayed, and viewers were made aware of how this could lead to frustration in the work situation.

3.4.3 Workers' Responses to Zulu Version

The worker group which saw the Zulu version of the film commented particularly on the fact that the ending of the film was favourable to workers. This seems to bear out the suggestions that the ending of the film, the successful use of

the grievance procedure, relied more upon verbal than visual impact. Therefore, those workers who saw the version with the narration in Zulu were more aware and appreciative, of what actually had happened in the final sequences.

They were also impressed by the fact that senior management was seen to be fair and understanding, although they felt that this was quite unusual. One participant expressed the view that, if ever he started his own business, he felt he might adopt the same approach to disputes as senior management had in the film.

This group also spoke very favourably of the way Rautenbach supervised his workers, expressing the opinion that the present industrial turmoil could easily be resolved if such supervisors were more common. This contrasts with the management view of Van Wyk as an exaggerated and isolated example.

3.4.4 Workers Responses to the English Version

Like the other worker group who saw the English version, this group was particularly impressed by the display of worker unity.

This group focused strongly on the role of Lucas, and thought it would be advantageous to have somebody like Lucas in their company.

Like the other worker groups, this group saw the film as being most realistic.

3.5 Problems with the film in its present form

This section reflects mainly management views. Workers expressed few criticisms and it is hard to say if this is because they found the film realistic or because of unfamiliarity with the medium or simply an unwillingness to criticise.

1. Several managers mentioned the lack of clarity as to whether Van Wyk had actually issued incorrect instructions. It is interesting to note that workers commented that it was unimportant whether or not the instructions were correct - it was Van Wyk's way of speaking to and dealing with Sam that was wrong. Managers, on the other hand, felt that the correctness or otherwise of the instructions placed all subsequent behaviour in a different light.

2. Some managers perceived an anti-management, or anti-white bias. This is inevitable. Where there are such great differences in perception it is not possible to make a film that will be endorsed by both sides and the film makers have to decide for which group the film must be made most plausible. To illustrate: one worker commented that for him the film was realistic because "it shows that the whites treat us like dogs". Remove the "anti-white" bias and, for this one worker at least, the realism has also gone. It must be emphasised that not all managers regarded the film as biased, and only a few workers expressed the sentiments embodied in this quote.

3. Practical issues, such as the fact of workers not wearing protective footwear, and an incorrect worker-supervisor ratio, were raised.

4. The degree to which workers understand the soundtrack is a problem. The English narration clearly presented difficulties. Further investigation is needed to determine whether the Zulu narration is adequate for a workforce speaking several home languages.

5. Some managers commented that the absence of warnings before dismissal etc. was unrealistic, a view that was not endorsed by workers.

3.5 Conclusion

3.5.1 Use of the Film for Extending an Understanding of Interpersonal Relationships

Bearing in mind that the study is flawed because the research field was unable to interview workers from the same organisation as the managers, it is not possible to say whether the differences between manager and worker perceptions are due to differences between organisations in IR philosphy and the IR structures and procedures that have been set up or are due to factors such as rank and race. That the latter does play some part is suggested by the differences between managers themselves.

One of the most striking results to emerge from the responses to this film are the great differences between management and worker responses. Some managers regard the film as unrealistic because they believe that assaults and arbitrary dismissals no longer occur. Some workers express their doubt about the scenes where a worker is reinstated, and where a strike is resolved by negotiaton, but all other sections of the film are regarded as realistic. This indicates the potential usefulness of the film in an area other than that of simple grievance procedure training: its use as a tool for exploring management-worker differences in perceptions, and as an aid to determining what steps can be taken to rectify them. This film, which appears to portray a building site accurately, but which can be discussed without the threat involved in discussing one's own site, could serve as the vehicle for examining these issues. This is not to say that either side's view is right or wrong, but the reasons for differing views need to be explored. Each party's experience of the reality may be different, and an awareness of these differences and of the factors responsible for them needs to be created.

3.5.2 Use of the Film for Instruction on Company Grievance Procedures

Based on this limited sample, how successful is the film likely to be as a tool for grievance procedure training? If it is not used properly it is not likely to be very successful. As has been pointed out in the main body of the report, a worker who comes from and returns to a site in which there is no successfully functioning grievance procedure, is not likely to learn or retain much about grievance procedure functioning. Judging from the workers' post-film comments, the concept of worker representation, and discussion with management as a way of solving problems, are the ideas which have been most successfully communicated. It therefore requires a post film discussion, or even several discussions, to focus attention on the grievance procedure and the specific steps to be followed on any given site.

Discussion would be focused on what actually happened in the final sequences of the film. The role of worker representatives and the operation of the grievance procedure could be explained. If necessary, that segment of the film could be rerun to emphasise the point. The steps in the grievance procedure shown in the film may be compared with the steps in the procedures which operate on the sites with which viewers are familiar. A manual for such discussions is being prepared.

3.5.3 Use of the Film for Management Training

What message is conveyed by the striking workers in the film? This is clearly a sensitive issue, for both management and workers. Some management respondents felt uneasy about the effect these scenes were likely to have on workers. This in itself would seem to provide a fruitful question for a management-only group discussion.

- Why do these scenes provoke so much unease?
- What do they show that workers have not already been exposed to by the media or in real life?
- Why is it assumed that, of the different options shown, workers would find the strike option the most attractive?
- On their own building site, what has been or should be done to make the use of the grievance procedure a more attractive option?

The film would seem to provide an ideal catalyst for a discussion which would enable a management team to clarify their own attitudes at one remove from reality before being faced with real-life conflict. The wide range of management views on this issue bodes well for a lively discussion, if it is properly led, and participants are encouraged to air conflicting views.

3.5.4 Use of the Film for Supervisor Training

The film shows very clearly some of the most important differences between good and bad supervisor behaviour and the consequences that can flow from the latter. Both managers and workers readily recognise both forms of behaviour and some even comment on how their eyes have been opened by seeing such behaviour so vividly portrayed. This suggests that the film could have a very useful application in supervisor training (irrespective of the race of the supervisor) particularly if followed by discussions analysing the behaviour portrayed.

3.5.5 Use of the Film for Instructing Workers on General IR Principles

Workers also expressed a wide range of views on this issue, from the negative effects of a strike in terms of loss of pay to the positive effects of worker solidarity. This also indicates a fruitful area for discussion, with the possibility

of workers themselves raising conflicting issues. Again it is imperative, if this issue is to be fully appreciated, that the film should be followed by discussion as laid down in the manual.

Workers should have the opportunity of comparing the two solutions to conflict offered in the film - the strike and the grievance procedure. The discussion leader would focus attention on successive points made in the film such as the occurrence of personal problems, their effects on the people involved and others when they are mishandled, the importance of group support for the individual when he has a grievance, the risks the members of the group are taking, the harm that management and workers can suffer if the dispute is badly handled, the roles of management and worker representatives, and the role and value of mutually accepted structures for resolving such personal and interpersonal problems. Having made the workers aware of the messages the film conveyed, discussion would be opened, for workers themselves to examine the pros and cons of what was shown, when applied to their own work situation.

This approach may reinforce the nervousness of managers who feel the film would "give the workers ideas". The question must then be asked as to whether these ideas are likely to be due to the influence of the film, or whether they are more likely to have been in existence already. If the latter, management is provided with an opportunity for learning of at least some of the factors responsible for workers preferring the strike as a means of conflict resolution. Such factors might be a bad personal experience with an incorrectly administered grievance procedure, or an ineffective works committee, or even from broader political factors over which management has no control, but whose consequences they must nevertheless deal with. Discussing these matters openly also affords management the opportunity of putting across their own point of view, a view which is in all probability seldom heard when strikes are discussed in hostels or townships.

CHAPTER 4

4. WHERE THE FILM "INDABA YE GRIEVANCE" COULD HAVE BEEN IMPROVED

4.1 More film should have been given to the negotiations ending the strike.

a) a build-up showing a group of workers dissatisfied at getting nowhere and Lucas suggesting a meeting,

b) workers entering the hall for the meeting,

c) the election of the group to meet with management.

4.2 "Workers committee" should have been used instead of "workers council".

4.3 More prominence should have been given to the workers committee.

a) a longer flash of the group negotiating with management

b) the group reporting back, explaining to the meeting

i) how and when workers committee is to be elected

ii) how the grievance procedure is to work

(the explanation should be in the narration).

4.4 Van Wyk should have been shown giving the wrong measurement. (This is to emphasise the need for solid grounds when initiating a grievance procedure).

4.5 In the second incident between Van Wyk and Sam, Van Wyk's dismissal of Sam should have bee replaced by Van Wyk swearing at and hitting Sam and Sam reporting this to Lucas. (To avoid confusion with disciplinary procedures).

APPENDIX 1

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS TRAINING FILM
SCRIPT VERSION : 6

Produced for the NIPR by Kevin Harris Film Productions

List of Characters

Sam Mahathini	- a construction worker
Tom	- another construction worker sharing a room with Sam
Lucas	- another construction worker who is spokesman for the striking workers and later their representative on the workers' council
Aaron	- similar to Lucas
Rautenbach	- a patient supervisor
Van Wyk	- an impatient supervisor
David Serobe	- an industrial relations manager

Contacts

NIPR - Mr Richard Hall : Head Industrial Relations Group
339-4451 (work)

Kevin Harris - Producer/Director
726-4809 (home and work)

Objects

To show an audience of Black unskilled workers the advantages of making proper use of a grievance procedure.

Duration

25 - 30 minutes

Technique

Dramatisation of two dispute situations. In the first situation, grievance procedure is not available, and the incident escalates resulting in a strike, a loss in production and subsequent dismissal, and loss of wages.

With the second incident, the grievance procedure is made use of, the dispute is satisfacorily resolved, with no loss in production and with no loss to the workers.

It is envisaged that the use of professional actors will be kept to a minimum; where possible authentic people involved in their every working day with the various roles portrayed in the script will be typecast in the situations occurring within two scenarios in order to achieve the maximum authenticity possible and hence establish credibility with the viewers with regard to the way in which characters respond in the various situations portrayed. Actors will speak in the vernacular accompanied by an underlying commentary. There will be two versions of the film - one with the commentary in Zulu and the other in English.

SCRIPT OUTLINE - FIFTH DRAFT

1 - Scene 1 (Hostel dormitory and building site)

Cut to a group of six men sitting around a coal stove inside a hostel dormitory on a weekend afternoon - drinking tea, smoking - relaxing and chatting.

Cut to Tom, who says he has lost his job as his supervisor didn't like him and made things difficult until there was a fight.

Cut to "First principal character" (whose name is Sam) who says that things were once like that in his job but the situation has improved since they negotiated to have a grievance procedure introduced.

The other members of the group become interested and enquire what it is all about.

1 - Scene 2 (Building site and hostel dormitory)

Cut to Sam who starts to relate his story.

He tells of how he had been working for a particular firm for just over three years.

All this time he had worked under a "good" supervisor who was interested in the workers, who trained them well and treated them fairly. For three years, he enjoyed his job, worked hard, and was proud of the company and the job he had learned to do. (Cut away from Sam to show scente depicting what he is saying. Establish supervisor's character by showing him listening to a labourer and constructively understanding the issue being put to him).

Cut back to Sam talking to group as he continues his story.

He tells of how, after three years, because of his good record, he had been moved to a more complicated job.

He was now placed under a different supervisor who was not like his old supervisor.

This man was impatient - he was not prepared to take time to train workers properly for the new jobs. (Show scenes establishing this supervisor's character - shouting orders - confronting a labourer on an issue).

He felt that this supervisor did not like him, probably because he had done well and got this promotion and the supervisor had it in for him (Show supervisor shouting at Sam).

From that time he felt very unhappy at work; he did not feel confident doing his job and he knew he was not working well. (Show scene of worker doing his work with obvious anxiety).

When he tried to ask the supervisor things about the job, the supervisor was rude to him and made him feel stupid, so he stopped asking questions. (Establish a specific point concerning the job done by Sam about which he was not clear and show him attempting to gain clarity from the supervisor, but without success).

From then on, things started going wrong.

One day, someone stole his boots from his locker, but there was nothing he could do - he knew that he could not talk to his supervisor.

Then, one morning - he had received a letter from his wife in the homeland saying that their child was very ill and this was worrying him - he thought he may need to ask for time off to go back to the homeland, but was dreading having to ask the supervisor, who would have some deriding comment to make. Knowing the way the supervisor felt about him he feared that if he did go home, when he returned he may find that he had lost his job.

He was working when he saw the supervisor standing and watching him work.

He tells how this distracted him and he made an error.

The supervisor saw this, came up to him and started swearing at him about the mistake.

Because of everything that had happened and his feeling about the supervisor, he tells how he lost his temper and swore back at the supervisor as he tried to defend himself.

During the above, cut away from Sam and group in hostel dormitory to scenes depicting the story he is relating.

1 - Scene 3 (building site)

Supervisor and Sam engaged in argument. The supervisor - using *abusive language - orders Sam* to clock out, saying that he will be fired. The supervisor then departs.

Fuming, Sam starts unbuttoning his overalls and walking across the construction site to the locker-room.

As he walks off, the other workers gather around him asking what has happened.

Sam, still visibly angry, tells them, saying that he is sick of the situation and does not want to work in a place where men are treated like dirt. He walks off.

As Sam walks away, other men call out to him, asking what has happened. He tells them. Quickly a small group muttering angrily gathers around him. A supervisor appears and orders the men back on to the site. They reply angrily that Sam should be reinstated. An argument develops and the noise attracts more men and other supervisors.

The section foreman and contract manager appear. The contract manager asks what is going on. Two self-appointed spokesmen step forward and demand that Sam be reinstated and the supervisor fired. The manager says that the men must return to work and he will investigate the matter. In the meantime Sam will be suspended. The spokesmen repeat their demands which are echoed by several voices in the crowd. The manager then says that if the men are not back at work in 20 minutes their section of the site will be shut down and the men will lose half a day's pay. The men start walking away in increasing numbers, talking angrily amongst themselves.

1 - Scene 4 (exterior - BIFSA Training Centre)

Later at the main entrance to the construction site

A large and noisy crowd is gathered and the managing director, with other managers beside him, is addressing the men. He promises that the matter will be investigated and if Sam has been unfairly treated he will be reinstated without loss of pay. The crowd demands immediate reinstatement and the two spokemen come forward and repeat this. The manager then warns the men that those who are not back at work the following morning will have dismissed themselves, and they will not be paid for the period they have not worked. He and the other managers leave and the crowd, still angry, streams away.

1 - Scene 5 (a church hall in the township)

Cut to meeting of workers in a church hall in the township.

The meeting is lead by the two self-appointed spokesmen and the issues surrounding the strike and its possible implications are discussed.

It is decided that a delegation of workers should go to see management to negotiate the reinstatement of all the workers, and to resolve the initial conflict issue that sparked off the strike.

1 - Scene 6 (deserted building site)

Scene showing the construction site empty and still. The gates are locked and security guards with dogs patrol the fence. A group of workers stands at the factory gates looking in.

1 - Scene 7 (boardroom of construction company

Cut to sequence in boardroom representing workers' delegation negotiating wi' a management team.

1 - Scene 8 (church hall in the township)

Cut to meeting of workers in the church hall (established previously) in the township.

The delegation are reporting back to the workers after their meeting with management.

They say that if the workers agree to return to work at 7 a.m. the next morning, they will be reinstated but they will not be paid for the two days they have not worked. Sam will be suspended until his case has been investigated.

Management has also agreed to set up a Works Council with elected worker representagives who will meet regularly with management to discuss matters of concern to the workers.
The Works Council and management will discuss setting up a grievance procedure to be used when workers feel they have been treated unfairly.

The delegation asks the workers if they accept these terms.

A voice from the crowd says that the workers should get full pay for the two days but another says, how can they if they have not worked?

The meeting then accepts the deal as negotiated.

The meeting is closed with the workers standing and singing "Inkosi Sikelele Afrika".

1 - Scene 9 (hostel dormitory)

Cut back to group listening to Sam explaining how the men including himself were reinstated although they had lost two days pay and how this new "grievance procedure" that developed out of the negotiations between management and the workers' delegation had really been a good thing.

He goes on to relate how sometime later a similar incident arose on the site involving the same supervisor. As he relates his story, cut to 2 - Scene 1.

2 - Scene 1 (building site)

Sam's voice-narrative carries over the visuals as he relates the story. Sam is busy carrying out his job. In the process, he commits an error and is confronted again by the supervisor and another argument ensues.

The supervisor orders Sam to clock out, saying that he will be fired. He then walks off.

2 - Scene 2 (building construction site)

As Sam walks towards the locker room, men call out to him, asking what has happened. They gather round him as he angrily explains what has happened.

2 - Scene 3 (building construction site)

The worker representative joins the group, interrupts Sam. Meanwhile a supervisor orders the men back to work.

The representative tells Sam that the matter has not been correctly handled and that he should submit a grievance through the grievance procedure.

Sam asks how a grievance procedure can help him. The representative then explains what a grievance procedure is, how it works and offers to help Sam.

2 - Scene 4 (an office at construction site)

The worker representative and Sam walk to an office, the worker representaive picks up a grievance form (close-up shot of this) and

asks the operator for a statement. Sam says that he was given a job without being properly shown how to do it, and when he made a mistake the supervisor swore at him. This made him angry and he swore back.

The supervisor then told him to clock out and that he would be fired. This is written down by the worker representataive, signed by Sam and countersigned by the worker representative.

2 - Scene 5 (back on the construction site)

The worker representative and Sam approach the supervisor and hand him the grievance form. He reads it. The representative suggests they discuss the matter, but the supervisor says that Sam does not know his job and must be fired and he will pass the matter on to the foreman.

2 - Scene 6 (interior Manager's office - construction site)

Manager seated at his desk. Seated before him on one side are the foreman and supervisor, and on the other side are the representative and Sam. The manager says that this is a serious matter and has, in terms of the grievance procedure, been referred to him by the foreman. The manager then reads out the statement on the form and asks the supervisor what he has to say. The supervisor says that Sam was shown how to do his job and became abusive when his mistakes were pointed out. The manager then asks Sam what instructions he has received and using this, cross-questions the supervisor who evenually admits the instruction had been hurried as he had been called away to another problem and also that he had used strong language as he had been angered at the waste of material. In reply to questions from the manager, the foreman says that Sam has always been on time and had received promotion from another section to his present job and that the supervisor's section had been under pressure because of rush jobs. The manager than says that as Sam had not received proper instruction and as he had used bad language under provocation, he would be reinstated without loss of pay, but as the bad language was against company rules, he reprimands him. Stressing the need for men to work together, he asks Sam and the representataive if they are satisfied and they say they are.

He indicates that the matter is closed, but instructs the foreman and the supervisor to remain behind. The representative and Sam leave. The manager then reprimands the supervisor for not properly training the operator and for using bad language. The foreman and supervisor then leave.

2 - Scene 7 (an office - construction site

At a meeting of worker representatives, the representative involved is being congratulated on his handling of the incident.

2 - Scene 8 (township - interior community hall)

Large crowd of workers is addressed by the work representative who outlines the dispute and the manner in which is has been settled.

This is interpreted as victory for the workers, who indicate their satisfaction with the outcome with suitable cries of "Amandla", etc.

Cut back to group of men talking in hostel dormitory.

2 - Scene 9 (hostel dormitory)

Sam talking to group of men at hostel. He expresses his opinion that this method of handling the dispute was definitely of benefit to management but more especially to the workers.

Others in the group agree with Sam that workers should make use of the grievance procedure to resolve a dispute, rather than go on strike. Tom agrees that this procedure is preferable. Sam points out that through the efforts of many workers in many places, managements have accepted the need for grievance procedures as a check on unfair actions.

Grievance procedures may not always help the worker, but they should always be tried as a first step whenever the worker feels he has a good cause.

Music - superimpose and credits.

Fade music and picture to black.

APPENDIX 2

NARRATION FOR DOCUMENTARY - "GRIEVANCE

(The numbered asterisks indicate where additional text was inserted for the Zulu narration - see inserts at end of script)

This is one of the many stories about the workers' struggle. It is a story about comradeship between men on construction - workers standing together in their struggle against injustice.

12 secs

I am Sam Makhatini- the one wearing the T-shirt - these are my hostel mates and fellow workers, and this is our story

10 secs

We are - all four of us - shutterhands; and like most workers on construction, we are recruited from the homelands on a twelve month contract.

12 secs

More so than others, the worker recruited from the homelands is at the mercy of the system.
If you lose your job, you cannot stay in the city and look for work; you must go back to the homeland - to the long queues of the unemployed waiting for recruitment.
So you must be very careful not to lose your job.

20 secs

Most construction workers from the big companies live in the George Goch single-sex hostel complex.
Living in single-sex hostels, away from your family for eleven months of the year, is not a good life.
This is my fourth year of living like this and I can say that family life really suffers.

It's tough living away from your wife and family for so long, and to my children I'm a stranger, a man who brings them presents once a year.

25 secs

On weekdays it's the same routine.
On site at seven in the morning; knock-off at four-thirty; back at the hostel around six-thirty in the evening in time to cook supper and see to your laundry.

12 secs

On this particular night, I noticed that our room-mate, Tom was not in the kitchen cooking his supper.
When we went back to the room to eat, I saw him sitting alone writing a letter.

15 secs

He was unusually quiet and did not want anything to eat - which for Tom is very strange.
It was then that we discovered that he had lost his job that afternoon.

12 secs

For some time, Tom had been having trouble with his Supervisor who did not like him.
Now there had finally been an argument and Tom was fired without notice.
We started talking about Supervisors and how they affect your job. I had been working on construction for four years now, and I began telling the others about my experiences with good and bad Supervisors.

25 secs

For the first three years on construction I worked for one company under the same Supervisor - a good man whose name was Rautenbach. /continued...

He was very patient and always gave good instructions, showing you on the plan what he wanted.
If you were'nt sure about anything you could always ask him and he would explain.
He had no problem working with people and when he came back to check the job, it had always been done the right way.

40 secs

The others had heard me talk about Van Wyk; most workers in our company knew his name and tried not to work under him.
Tom had not heard the stories about Supervisor Van Wyk, so I started to tell him about the time I was transferred to his section.
That was the time he made me so angry, I nearly hit him with a hammer.

22 secs

35 secs

Supervisor Van Wyk was an impatient man.
He would not take the time to give good instructions; instead he would interrupt your job and shout at you, making you unsure about what he wanted.

18 secs

I knew that he did not like me from the time I was transferred to his section and it was very difficult for me to work with him.

11 secs

When I tried to ask him questions about the job, he was rude and made me feel stupid.
So I stopped asking questions.

From that time on I was very unhappy in my work.
I did not feel confident with the job and could not work well.

/continued ...

It became worse when other things started going wrong.
One morning when I was changing to go on site, I found that my boots had been stolen.

13 secs

On top of having to pay for a new pair, I was late on site.
I did not even bother to try and explain to Supervisor Van Wyk but just stood there while he shouted at me and told me that he was taking off two hours pay for the time I had lost.

15 secs

Two weeks later, I got a letter from my wife to say that our first-born was very ill.
My wife works as a domestic - living in during the week - and her mother looks after our children in a rural area.
Her employers were not sympathetic and she would lose her job if she went back home to be with the child for a few weeks.
She wanted me to come home as soon as possible to take the child to the doctor.

24 secs

I was very worried and felt terrible.
I would have to go to Van Wyk and try to explain.
He would be rude and shout, and if he did let me go home, I would probably find that when a came back I had lost my job; it was just the kind of excuse he was waiting for to get rid of me.
All this was worrying me on the job; and then Van Wyk started with me again.

16 secs

*1
It did not take me long before the men on site caught up with me to find out what had happened.
Half an hour later, the whole workforce had stopped working 20 secs
and eventually the Manpower Manager came out to the site to 6 secs
try and tell the men to go back to work. 12 secs

*2
The men were not at all happy with what the Manpower Manager had to say; they wanted Supervisor Van Wyk fired and me re-instated immediately.,
Once again Lucas - together with Aaron - came out of the crowd to put forward the demands of the workforce.

*3
A strike was called, and with the entire workforce standing together, no one went back to work the next morning.

After two days of striking, the men were getting worried; the job had come to a standstill, they were losing pay, and it seemed as if the problem would not be solved in this way. Not really knowing what to do next, some of us stood outside the main gate which was locked and guarded by security with fierce dogs.
On the third day, Lucas and Aaron decided to organise the workers and called a meeting to discuss what steps should be taken.

20 secs

At the meeting, it was decided that Lucas and Aaron should lead a delegation of workers in a meeting with management to negotiate the re-instatement of all the workers including myself. They should also talk to management about how future grievances concerning unfair treatment might be sorted out to stop this kind of situation happening again.

20 secs.

*4
Management agreed that if the workforce returned to work by seven o'clock the next morning, then there would be no dismissals. I was suspended until my case could be investigated. They also agreed that the delegation of workers headed by Lucas at the meeting should represent the workers in negotiations with management to set up a grievance procedure by which future disputes would be settled.

Management said that they were not willing to pay the workforce for the time lost.

After the meeting, Lucas reported back to the workforce.
The workers were happy about the re-instatement and that a grievance procedure was to be negotiated by the workers' committee and management to settle future problems.
They disagreed about management's refusal to pay for time lost.

Some felt that we should insist on being paid because what had happened was management's fault and not theirs.
Others felt that we could not expect to get paid for time not worked.
The workers finally agreed that they should accept the loss of pay because they has been successful in getting management to agree to negotiate with the workforce for a grievance procedure that would prevent unfair treatment of workers in the future.

I think we all realised that the strike had nearly cost us all our jobs, and that the best way to solve problems is for workers and management to meet and negotiate.
We now have a good grievance procedure negotiated by our on-site workers' council.

15 secs

Tom was curious about this and wanted to know how a workers' council and grievance procedure worked.
I continued my story.
Three months after the strike, I was again working in Supervisor Van Wyk's section and he gave me a wrong instruction.

18 secs

*5
I thought that this time I had lost my job for sure.
Who would believe me - that it was not my fault and that the Supervisor had given me the wrong instruction.

As I was walking off Lucas came to me and asked me what had happened.
He was now a representative of the workers on the workers' council and when he heard my story, he told me to come with him to fill out a grievance form.

I agreed to do this and went with him to his office.
On the way there he asked me everything about what had happended, what instructions I had been given, whether any of the other workers had heard the Supervisor giving me the instruction, and what Supervisor Van Wyk had said when he fired me.

Then we sat down at Lucas' desk and he started to write all the details down on the grievance form.

*6
Supervisor Van Wyk was then asked to give his side of the story.

He said that he had had trouble with me many times in the past and that whenever he gave me a job to do, it was not carried out correctly.
He said that these mistakes cost the company a lot of time and materials, and he was concerned about this.
He said that when he came back and found that the column was not the right height, he became angry and fired me.

I was then asked to tell my side of the story.

After David Serobe translated what I had said, the contract manager said that, having listened to both sides of the story - and also having spoken to the men on site who saw what happened - he felt that I was telling the truth and that Supervisor Van Wyk had given me the wrong instruction.

He said that I was to be re-instated immediately without loss of pay, but warned me that I should not be disrespectful to any Supervisor in the future.

When management asked us how we felt about their decision, we agreed that they had been fair in the hearing of the case and we told them we were satisfaied.

The contract manager thanked everyone for attending the meeting and said that we should now consider the matter closed and get back to the job immediately.
He asked Supervisor Van Wyk if he would stay behind for a few minutes.
He then asked if Lucas and I wished to say anthing more.
We replied that we wished to thank management for their handling of the incident.
We then left the meeting.

Lucas was very happy with the way that the meeting had turned out and was impressed that management had viewed the case fairly - particularly because this was the second incident involving my being dismissed by the same Supervisor.

*7
After hearing my story we all agreed that the election of a workers' council and the introduction of the grievance procedure negotiated by the council with management had definitely been a very good thing.

The grievance procedure had stopped me losing my job and had avoided a strike causing time lost and loss of pay - and the men risking losing their jobs.

We agreed that grievance procedures may not always be able to help the worker, but they should always be tried as a first step whenever the worker feels he has a good cause.

I really felt sorry for Tom - his company did not have a grievance procedure and he felt that he has been unfairly dismissed.
He has lost his job because of the Supervisor and there was nothing he could do about it.

ADDITIONAL / ALTERED NARRATION FOR "ZULU LANGUAGE VERSION" OF "GRIEVANCE"

NARRATION PAGE 4

Place earlier:

1*
Insert:

"While supervisor Van Wyk was trying to get the men back to work, the Site Agent and Contract Manager came over to see what was happening.

When Van Wyk started telling the story his way, I thought I would be fired for sure.
He said that I did not know my job and that I had sworn at him so he fired me.

But then Lucas stood up for me.

The Contract Manager seemed impatient and told the Site Agent to get the men back to work and that I should be suspended while management investigated the incident.

The rest of the workers - having seen Lucas taking a stand stood with us, and when the Site Agent told them I was to be suspended refused to go back to work.

The Site Agent told them that if they would not go back to work they should leave the site.
Without hesitating, the workers who had seen what had happened between supervisor Van Wyk and myself walked off the site with me and Lucas.

2*
Insert after "and tell the men to get back to work."

"The Manpower Manager addressed the men and told them that management would investigate the incident and if it was found that I had been

dismissed unfairly, then I would be re-instated with full pay.
The men were not ..." continue as per script.

3*
PAGE 5

"David Serobe, the company's Industrial Relations Officer did all the interpreting between management and the workforce.
He told the manpower manager that the men were not happy with what management had decided and that they wanted Supervisor Van Wyk fired and me re-instated immediately.
The men also wanted to know whether management was prepared to pay me and the entire workforce for the time that was being lost since the work stoppage.

The manpower manager replied that management would investigate the incident and if it was found that I had been unfairly dismissed I would be re-instated with full pay.
He then said that those workers who did not return to work the next morning should consider themselves dismissed.

The men refused to accept these terms offered by the manpower manager.

A strike was called ..." continue as per script.

4*
FAGE 5
Insert

"The next day the delegation met with managment.
Management were represented by the Contract Manager and the Site Agent with David Serobe acting as interpreter.
Management agreed ...." continue as per script.

5*

PAGE 6

"... When he checked on the job and found it was not correct, the trouble started.
In his usual manner - without first showing me on the plan - Van Wyk had given me the instruction that this column was to be constructed 3,8 meters high.
Now he was saying that he had told me that it must be four meters high.
I thought that this time ..." continue as per script.

6*

PAGE 7

"When Lucas had finished taking down the details he read out what he had written and told me to sign the form if I was happy that what he had written was what I had told him had happened.
He then signed the form to show that he had written down what I had told him.

Lucas gave Supervisor Van Wyk the grievance form to hand to management.

The next day, the meeting was held.

The Contract Manager opened the meeting by reading out the details of my dismissal from the grievance form handed in by Lucas and myself.

David Serobe was present to interpret so that everybody would understand quite clearly everything that was being said.

Supervisor Van Wyk was then asked ...." continue as per script.

7*

PAGE 8

Insert

"Management were obviously very concerned about the dispute and wanted to make sure that this kind of situation should be avoided in the future.

The contract manager told Supervisor Van Wyk that the labour force on site was very important to the success of the project and it was important to management that all the men should work together as a team. The Site Agent told Van Wyk that the Supervisors should make sure that there was a good working relationship between themselves and the workers on site because only in this way could the men work together constructively as a team.

After work, Lucas reported back to the workers' council who congratulated us on our successful handling of my grievance.

At the weekend a meeting was held with the entire workforce and my re-instatement was applauded." continue as per script.

UKULANDISA NGEMIBHALO EFANELEYO - "GRIEVANCE" (ISIKHALO)

Lena ngenye yezindaba eziningi eziphathelene nomzabalazo wabasebenzi. Lena yindaba mayelana nobudlelwano phakathi kwabasebenzi bezinkontileka - abasebenzi abahlangene emzabalazweni wabo wokulwa nokungesiwo umthetho.

12 amasekhondi

Ngingu Sam Makhatini - ngigqoke isikipa (T-shirt) - laba ngihlala nabo ehositela futhi sisebenza ndawonye, nansi indaba yethu

10 amasekhondi

Sobane singabakhi enkontilakini yomeselani; njengabo bonke abasebenzi bomeselani, silandwe kumaHomeland phansi kwenkontilaki yezinyanga ezingu-12

12 amasekhondi

Ngaphezu kwabanye, isisebenzi esilandwe kumaHomeland njalo nje sisemseni kaHulumeni.
Uma ulahlekelwa umsebenzi wakho, awukwazi ukuhlala edolobheni ufune umsebenzi; kufanele ubuyele kuHomeland yakho - lapho uhlangana nezindwendwe zabantu abangasebenzi abamele ukuqashwa.
Ngakho-ke kufanele uqaphele ungalahlekelwa umsebenzi wakho.

20 amasekhondi

Abasebenzi abaningi bomeselani bezinkampani ezinkulu bahlala ehositela yamadoda odwa eGeorge Goch. Ukuhlala ehositela yamadoda, kude nomdeni wakho izinyanga ezingu-11 zonyaka akuyona impilo enhle.

Lona ngunyaka wami wesine ngiphila lempilo futhi ngingasho ukuthi impilo yomndeni iyasokola ngempela. Kunzima ngempela ukuhlala kude nenkosikazi yakho kanye nomndeni wakho isikhathi eside kangaka, ezinganeni zami ngifana nesihambi, indoda ebaphathela izipho kanye ngonyaka.

25 amasekhondi

Phakathi neviki inqubo iyafana.
Ngingena ngo-7 ekuseni emsebenzini; ngiphuma emsebenzini ngo-4.30 ntambama; ngifika ehositela ngabo 6.30 kusihlwa ngifike ngipheke isapha ngiwashe izimpahla zami.

12 amasekhondi

Ngalobubusuku, ngaqaphela ukuthi omunye esilala naye, uTom wayengekho ekhishini ukupheka isapha yakhe.
Lapho sibuyela endlini ukuyokudla, ngambona ehlezi yedwa ebhala incwadi.

15 amasekhondi

Wayethule ngokungajwayelekile engafuni lutho oludliwayo - okungajwayelekile ngo-Tom.
Yilapho sathola khona ukuthi ulahlekelwe umsebenzi wakhe ngaleyontambama.

12 amasekhondi

Kwase kuyisikhashana uTom enezinkinga noSupervisor wakhe owayengamthandi uTom.
Wayenza impilo nezinto kubelukhuni kuTom ngamabomu.
Okokugcina kwaba nempikiswano eyalandelwa ukuba uTom axoshwe emsebenzini ngaphandle kwenothisi.
Saqala sakhuluma ngo-Supervisor nokuthi bawuthikameza kanjani umsebenzi wakho.
Sengisebenze komeselani iminyaka emine manje, ngaqala ngatshela engisebenza nabo ngokusebenza kwami nabo Supervisor abalungile nabangalungile.

25 amasekhondi

Eminyakeni emithathu yokuqala komeselani ngasebenzela inkampani eyodwa phansi kuka Supervisor oyedwa-indoda eyayilungile igama layo kungu-Rautenbach. Wayenozwelo njalo nje enikeza imiyalezo emihle, akukhombise epulanini ukuthi ufunani. Uma ungaqinisekile ngento ethile ungambuza ngaso sonke isikhathi bese ekuchazela.
Wayenqenayo inkinga yokusebenza nabantu kuthi noma ebuya ezosheka umsebenzi, kufumaniseke ukuthi umsebenzi wenziwe ngendlela efanele.

Abanye esisebenza nabo bake bangizwa ngikhuluma ngo Van Wyk; iningi labazebenzi enkampanini yethu babelazi igama lakhe futhi bezama njalo ukungasebenzi phansi kwakhe.
UTom akakaze ezwe izindaba ngo Supervisor Van Wyk, ngakho-ke ngaqala ukumtshela ngesikhathi ngishintshelwa kusekishini yakhe. Kungaleso sikhathi lapho angicasula khona, ngacishe ngamsakaza ngesando.

22 amasekhondi

35 amasekhondi

USupervisor Van Wyk wayengumuntu onenhliziyo encane. Wayengakwazi ukuthatha isikhathi ukunikeza imiyalezo emihle; kungenjalo wayemane aphazamise umsebenzi wakho akuthethise, akwenze ungabaze ngento ayifunayo.

18 amasekhondi

Nqangazi kahle kamhlophe ukuthi wayengangithandi kwalela ngesikhathi ngishintshelwa kusekishini yakhe okwenza kube nzima kimi ukusebenza naye.

11 amasekhondi

Uma ngizama ukumbuza imibuzo mayelana nomsebenzi, wayethetha angenze ngibukeke njengesiphukuphuku. Ngakho-ke ngagcina ukubuza imibuzo ngomsebenzi.

Kusukela ngalesosikhathi angizange ngawujabulela umsebenzi wami. Angibange ngisaqiniseka ngomsebenzi wami angangabe ngisakwazi ngisho nokuwenza kahle.

Kwabanzima kakhulu lapho ezinye izinto seziqala ukubheda zihamba ngendlela okungeyiyo.
Ngelinye ilanga ekuseni ngishintshela ukuya emsebenzini, ngathola ukuthi amabhuthi ami antshontshiwe.

13 amasekhondi

Ngaphezu kokuba kwakufanele ngikhokhele iphoya elisha lamabhuthi, ngafika leyithi emsebenzini.
Angizange ngize ngizihluphe ngithi ngizama ukuchazela uSupervisor Van Wyk kodwa ngafane ngazimela nje lapho engithethisa engitshela ukuthi uzokwephula imali yamahora amabili esikhathi engingasisebenzanga.

15 amasekhondi

Emva kwamasonto amabili, ngathola incwadi evela kumkami engibikela ukuthi umntwana wethu wokuqala uyagula ugula kakhulu Umkami usebenza emakhishini - ulala emsebenzini (emakhishini) phakathi neviki - umamezala nguyena obheka abantwana bethu emathuya Abaqashi bakhe babengenalo uzwelo wayengalahlekelwa umsebenzi uma eke waya ekhaya ukuze abe nabantwana amaviki ambalwa.
Ngakho-ke wacela ukuba ngibuye ekhaya ngokushesha ukuze ngise umntwana kwadokotela.

24 amasekhondi

Ngangikhathazeke kabi emhefumulweni ngizizwa ngilusizi.
Kwakufanele ngiye ku Van Wyk ngizame ukumchazela.Wayezoba nenhliziyo elukhuni angithethise, uma kwenzeka engivumela ngiye ekhaya, kwakunokwenzeka ukuthi kuthi lapho ngibuya ekhaya ngithole ukuthi sengiphelelwe umsebenzi; kwakuyindlela ayeyilindele ukuba angixoshe ngayo emsebenzini.
Konke lokhu kwakungihlupha ngisesemsebenzini; kusenjano uVan Wyk waqala ngami futhi.

16 amasekhondi

Akuthathanga isikhathi eside ngaphambi kokuba engisebenza nabo bafune ukwazi ukuthi ngihlushwa yini.

Kwathi ngesikhathi uSupervisor Van Wyk esazama ukuqoqa bonke abantu babuyele emsebenzini, i Site Agent ne Contract Manager beza kimi ukuzothola kahle ukuthi kwenzenjani.

Kwathi lapho uVan Wyk eqala exoxa ebatshela okwenzekile ngendlela yakhe, ngabona ukuthi akukho okunye ngizovele ngixoshwe emsebenzini. Wabatshela ukuthi angiwazi umsebenzi wami futhi ngimethukile ngakho-ke ungixoshile emsebenzini.

Kodwa uLucas wazama ukungimela wangikhulumela.

I-Contract Manager yakhombisa ukucasuka yatshela i-Site Agent ukuthi ayitshele bonke abasebenzi babuyele emsebenzini yathi kufanele ngimiswe okwesikhashana ngingasebenzi ngesikhathi abaphathi besaluphenya loludaba.

Bonke laba abanye abasebenzi - bembonile uLucas ezama ukungimela bama nabo nathi; kwathi lapho i-Site Agent ibatshela ukuthi ngizomiswa okwesikhashana ngingasebenzi bala nabo ukubuyela emsebenzini.

i-Site Agent yabatshela ukuthi uma bengafuni ukubuyela emsebenzini kufanele baphume baphele emagcekeni asemsebenzini.
Ngaphandle kokungabaza, abasebenzi ababonile ukuthi kwenzenjani phakathi kwami noSupervisor Van Wyk baphuma emagcekeni asemsebenzini kanye nami noLucas.

Emva kwengxenye yehora, bonke abasebenzi bayeka ukusebenza ekugcineni i-Manpower Manager yaphuma izozama ukutshela incenge abasebenzi ukuba babuyele emsebenzini.

i-Manpower Manager yakhuluma nabasebenzi ibatshela ukuthi abaphathi bazolucubungula udaba lwami uma kutholakala ukuthi ngixoshwe ngokungemthetho, ngizobuyela emsebenzini ngikhokhelwe yonke imali yami kungadonswa lutho emholweni.

Abasebenzi abazange bakuthokozele okwakushiwo i-Manpower Manager; babefuna kuxoshwe uSupervisor Van Wyk bese ngibuyiselwa emsebenzini ngokushesha.

Waphinda futhi uLucas - ehambisana noAaron - beza phambi kwabasebenzi bazwakalisa izidingo namadimandi abasebenzi bonkana.

UDavid Serobe - umxhumanisi wabasebenzi nenkampani - nguyena owayehumusha phakathi kwabapathi nabasebenzi.

Watshela i-Manpower Manager ukuthi abasebenzi abenelisiwe ngesinqumo sabaphathi nokuthi bafuna ukuthi kuxoshwe u-Supervisor Van Wyk kubuyiselwe mina emsebenzini ngaphandle kokuchitha isikhathi. Abasebenzi bafuna futhi ukwazi ukuthi abaphathi bazimisele yini ukungikhokhela kanye nabo bonke abasebenzi imali yalesisikhathi esilahlekile kusukela ngesikhathi kuma umsebenzi.

I-Manpower Manager yaphendula ngokuthi abaphathi bazoluphenya loludaba uma kutholakala ukuthi ngixoshwe ngokungafanele ngizobuyiselwa emsebenzini ngaphandle kokudonselwa imali.

Lemenenja yabuye yathi labo basebenzi abangabuyelanga emsebenzini ekuseni ngosuku olulandelayo bayofana nabantu asebephelelwe umsebenzi.

Abasebenzi bayenqaba yonke lemibandela eyayishiwo i-Manpower Manager. Abasebenzi banquma ukuba bateleke, bonke abasebenzi beme ngazwi linye, akekho owabuyela emsebenzini ngakusasa ekuseni..

Emva kokuba isiteleka sesithathe izinsuku ezimbili; abasebenzi baqala ukukhathazeka; umsebenzi wawumile ungaqhubeki; babengaholi, kwacaca ukuthi lenkinga sengathi angeke ixazululeke ngalendlela.
Singazi ngempela ukuba yisiphi isinyathelo okufanele sisithathe, abanye bethu bama esangweni elikhulu lenkampani elalikhiyiwe kuqaphe kulo umantshingelane nenja enolaka. Ngosuku lwesithathu lwesiteleka, uLucas noAaron banquma ukuba baqoqe bahlanganise bonke abasebenzi babize umhlangano ukuze sinqume izinyathelo okufanele sizithathe.

20 amasekhondi

Emhlanganweni, kwanqunywa ukuthi uLucas noAaron kufanele bahole abamele abasebenzi emhlanganweni abazoba nawo nabaphathi ukuze babonisane ngokubuyiselwa kwabo bonke abasebenzi emsebenzini kanye nami. Kwakufanele futhi babonisane nabaphathi ukuthi kufanele izikhalo zixazululwe kanjani ngokuzayo mayelana nokungaphathwa kahle kwabasebenzi ukuze kunqandwe isimo esinjengalesi esenzekile singaphinde senzeke futhi.

20 amasekhondi

Ngosuku olulandelayo abamele abasebenzi bahlangana nabaphathi. Abaphathi babemelwe yi-Contract Manager kanye ne Site Agent uDavid Serobe yena wayezoba umhumushi

Abaphathi bavuma ukuthi uma abasebenzi bebuyela emsebenzini ngo-7 ekuseni ngosuku olulandelayo, ngeke kuxoshwe muntu.
Mina ngagizomiswa emsebenzini kuze kube semva kokuphenywa kodaba lwami.
Bavuma futhi ukuthi labo abamele abasebenzi beholwa uLucas emhlanganweni kufanele bamele abasebenzi ekubonisaneni nabaphathi ekutholeni indlela okuyiyona yona yokuxazulula izikhalo eyayizolandelwa ekubekeni izikhalo ngokuzayo. Abaphathi bathi abazimisele ukukhokhela abasebenzi lesisikhathi abangasisebenzanga.

Emva komhlangano, uLucas wabikela abasebenzi ngabaxoxe ngakho emhlanganweni.
Abasebenzi babethokozile ngokubuyela emsebenzini nokuthi indlela yokubeka nokuxazulula izikhalo ikomiti yabasebenzi nabaphathi babezobonisana ngayo ukuze kuxazululwe ngayo izinkinga ngokuzayo.
Abasebenzi abahambisananga nesinqumo sabaphathi sokwenqaba ukubakhokhela ngalesisikhathi abangasisebenzanga.

Abanye abasebenzi babephikelele bethi kufanele sicindezele ukuthi sikhokhelwe ngalesisikhathi esilahlekile ngoba lokhu okwenzekile kwabe kuyiphutha labaphathi hayi elethu.

Abanye benombono wokuthi akufanele silindele ukukhokhelwa ngesikhathi esingasisebenzanga.
Ekugcineni abasebenzi bavumelana ngokuthi kufanele bavume ukungakhokhelwa ngalesisikhathi esilahlekile ngoba baphumelele ukwenza abaphathi bavume ukubonisana nabasebenzi ekutholeni indlela yokubeka nokuxazulula izikhalo ukuze kunqandeke ukuphathwa kabi kwabasebenzi ngokuzayo.

Ngicabanga ukuthi sonke sabona ukuthi isiteleka sacishe senza salehlekelwa umsebenzi, nokuthi indlela engcono yokuxazulula izinkinga ukuba abasebenzi nabaphathi bahlangane babonisane.
Manje sesinendlela engcono yokubeka nokuxazulula izikhalo ewumbono womkhandlu wabasebenzi bezokwakha.

15 amasekhondi

UTom wayenomdlandla ngaloludaba efuna ukwazi ukuthi umkhandlu wabasebenzi nendlela yokuxazulula izikhalo kusebenza kanjani:
Ngaqhubeka nendaba yami.
Emva kwezinyanga ezintathu kade kunesiteleka, ngangisebenza futhi phansi kuka Supervisor Van Wyk kusekishini yakhe wanginikeza umyalezo okungewona.
Kwathi lapho esheka umsebenzi wathola ukuthi awulungile, yaqala futhi itrabuli.
Njengokujwayelekile - ngaphandle kokuqala ngokungikhombisa epulanini - Van Wyk wayenginike umyalezo wokuthi lekholamu kwakufanele yakhiwe ibe ngu-38 amamitha ukuphakama.
Manje wayesethi ungitshele ukuthi kufanele yakhiwe iphakame ngamamitha angu-4.

Ngalesisikhathi kwangicacela ukuthi ngempela ngizophelelwa umsebenzi. Ubani owayengangikholwa, ukuthi kwakungelona iphutha lami nokuthi i-Supervisor inginikeze umyalezo okungewona. Ngesikhathi ngiphuma lapho kwakhiwa khona uLucas weza kimi wabuza ukuthi kwenzenjani. Manje wayesemele abasebenzi kumkhandlu wabasebenzi okwathi angezwa udaba lwami, wangitshela ukuba ngimlandele ngiyogcwalisa ifomu yezikhalo. Ngavuma ngase ngimlandela ngaya naye ehovisini lakhe. Endleleni siya e-ofisini lakhe wangibuza ngakho konke okwenzekile, nokuthi yimiphi imiyalezo (instructions) enginikezwe yona, nokuthi kukhona yini abanye abasebenzi abezwile ngesikhathi uSupervisor enginikeza imiyalezo, nokuthi uSupervisor Van Wyk utheni ngesikhathi engixosha.

Safika sahlala phansi e-ofisini lika Lucas waqala wabhala phansi yonke into kufomu yezikhalo.
Kwathi lapho uLucas eseqedile ukubhala phansi yonke imininigwane wafunda kakhulu konke akubhalile wangitshela ukuba ngisayine ifomu uma kungenelisa konke akubhalile ukuthi yilokhu engimtshele kona futhi yilokhu okwenzekile. Wabe eselisayina ifomu ukukhombisa ukuthi konke akubhalile yilokho engimtshele kona.

ULucas wanikeza u-Supervisor Van Wyk lefomu yezikhalo ukuba ayedlulisele kubaphathi.

Ngosuku olulandelayo, kwaba nomhlangano.

I-Contract Manager yavula umhlangano ngokufunda kakhulu yonke imininingwane yokuxoshwa kwami ebhalwe kufomu yezikhalo ephuma kimi noLucas.

UDavid Serobe wayekhona ezohumusha ukuze wonke owayekhona ezwe kahle yonke into eyayishiwo.
USupervisor Van Wyk wabe esecelwa ukuba abeke naye eyakhe indaba.
Wathi kade ehlangabezana nobunzima ngami izikhathi eziningi ezedlule nokuthi njalo nje uma enginikeza umsebenzi ukuba ngiwenze, wawungenziwa kahle ngendlela efanelekile. Wathi wonke lamaphutha ami afaka inkampani ezindlekweni ezinkulu mayelana nesikhathi nangematheriyeli, nokuthi yena yayimphatha kabi lento.
Wathi kuthe lapho ebuya ethola ukuthi ikholamu ayiphakamanga ngokufanele, wacasuka wayesengixosha.

Ngase ngicelwa ukuba nami ngisho uhlangothi lwami lwendaba.

Emva kokuba uDavid Serobe esehumushile konke engikushilo, i-Contract Manager yathi, emva kokulalela loludaba kithi sobabili - futhi nangemuva kokuxoxa nabanye abasebenzi lapho kwakhiwa khona ababonile ukuthi kwenzenjani - uyabona ukuthi ngikhuluma iqiniso nokuthi u-Supervisor Van Wyk ngempela unginikeze umyalezo oyiphutha okungewona. Wathi ngizobuyiselwa emsebenzini ngaphandle kokwephulelwa imali, kodwa wangiyala ukuthi ngihloniphe yinoma yimuphi u-Supervisor ngokuzayo.

Kwathi lapho abaphathi besibuza ukuthi sizizwa sinjani emva kwesinqumo sabo, savuma ukuthi baluxazulule kahle udaba ngokuba basilalele ngaphandle kobandlululo nokuthi senelisiwe yisinqumo sabo.

I-Contract Manager yabonga bonke ababekhona emhlanganweni nokuthi loludaba kufanele luthathwe njengoluphethiwe nokuthi kufanele sibuyele emsebenzini sonke ngokushesha. Wacela u-Supervisor Van Wyk ukuba ake asale naye kancane imizuzwana emibalwa.
Wayesebuza ukuthi ngabe kukhona yini mina noLucas esifisa ukukusho.
Saphendula ngelokuthi sifisa ukubonga abaphathi ngendlela abahlaziye ngayo loludaba.
Sabe sesiphuma emhlanganweni sihamba.

ULucas wayethokozile ngendlela umhlangano ohambe ngayo futhi enelisiwe yindlela yobuntu abaphathi abahlaziye ngayo udaba lwethu - ikakhulukazi njengoba lolu kwase kuwudaba lwesibili oluphathelene nami ngixoshwa u-supervisor oyedwa.

Abaphathi babekhathazekile ngendaba yokungezwani befuna ukuqiniseka ukuthi isimo esinjena singaphinde senzeke ngokuzayo.

I-Contract Manager yatshela u-Supervisor Van Wyk ukuthi abasebenzi lapho kwakhiwa khona babaluleke kakhulu ekuphumeleleni komsebenzi wenkampani, nokuthi kusemqoka kubaphathi ukuthi bonke abasebenzi basebenze ngokuzwana nangoku bambisana njengeqembu elilodwa.
I-Site Manager yatshela u Van Wyk ukuthi o-supervisor kufanele baqiniseke ukuthi kukhona ubudlelwane obuhle bokusebenza phakathi kwabo nabasebenzi lapho kwakhiwa khona ngoba kungalendlela kuphela lapho abasebenzi bengasebenza khona ngokuzwana nangempumelelo njengeqembu elilodwa.

Emva komsebenzi, uLucas wabikela umkhandlu wabasebenzi owasihalalisela ngokuphumelela kwethu ekuzwakaliseni isikhalo sami.

Ngempelasonto kwabizwa umhlangano wabasebenzi bonke lapho bakushayela ihlombe ukubuyiselwa kwami emsebenzini.

Emva kokuzwa udaba lwami sonke savumelana ngokuthi ukhetho lomkhandlu wabasebenzi nokusetshenziswa kwendlela entsha yokubeka nokuxazulula izikhalo eyaba umphumela wokubonisana phakathi komkhandlu wabasebenzi nabaphathi kube yinto enhle enempumelelo kakhulu.

Indlela yokuxazulula izikhalo yiyo eyenze ngingalahlekelwa umsebenzi wami futhi yiyo evimbele isiteleka esingenza silahlekelwe yisikhathi nomholo - nabasebenzi bariske ukulahlekelwa umsebenzi.

Savumelana ngokuthi izindlela noma inqubo yokuxazulula izikhalo kungenzeka ingaphumeleli njalo ekusizeni abasebenzi, kodwa kufanele sizizame lezizindlela kuqala njalo nje uma isisebenzi sibona ukuthi sinezizathu eziqinile.

Impela ngadabuka kakhulu ngoTom - inkampani yakhe yayingenayo indlela emisiwe yokuxazulula izikhalo nokuthi wayeneqiniso ukuthi uxoshwe ngokungemthetho.
Waphelelwa umsebenzi ngenxa ka-Supervisor futhi ingekho into angayenza ngalokho.

56 amasekhondi

APPENDIX 3

TYPICAL FILM SHOOTING SCHEDULE FOR FILM DOCUMENTARY ON GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES SET IN THE CONTEXT OF THE BUILDING CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

(Refer to script and breakdown of time and manpower requirements concerning Building Site 1 and Building Site 11; Building Sites 1 and 11 could be represented using one actual construction site).

	Period of time required	Actor requirements	Location requirements
DAY	09.00 - 10.00	Sam Good Supervisor	Section of building site operation
(1 Scene 2)	10.30 - 12.00	Sam Impatient Supervisor	Section of building site operation
Building Site	12.30 - 13.00	Impatient Supervisor	Section of building site operation
	13.00 - 14.00	LUNCH	
	14.00 - 17.00	Establishing shots of actuality building site operations on Building Site 1 - no interference to building operation	
(Bottom half page 3 - going into 1 Scene 3 - fight)	09.00 - 10.30	Sam Impatient Supervisor	Section of building site operation
	10.30 - 11.30	Sam Impatient Supervisor 8 Labourers	Same section of building site operation
DAY 2	11.30 - 14.00	Sam Impatient Supervisor Worker Representative 8 Labourers Section foreman Contract manager 2 Labourer spokesmen 20 more labourers	Same section of building site operation
	14.00 - 15.00	LUNCH	
	15.00 - 17.00	Pick-ups (any sequence not completed according to above schedule)	

	Period of time required	Actor requirements	Location requirements
DAY 3 BIFSA TRAINING CENTRE	14.00 - 17.00	Sam Impatient supervisor 2 Labourer spokesmen Contract manager Section foreman 8 Labourers Managing Director Management team 150-300 labourers to be supplied by BIFSA TRAINING CENTRE	Main entrance to BIFSA TRAINING CENTRE

DAY 4 Building Site 11			
(2 Scene 1)	09.00 - 11.00	Jacob Supervisor	Section of building site operation
(2 Scene 2)	11.00 - 12.00	Jacob Supervisor	Same section of building site operation
(2 Scene 3)	12.00 - 13.00	Jacob Worker representative Supervisor 8 Labourers	Same section of building site operation
(2 Scene 5)	13.00 - 14.00	Jacob Worker representative Supervisor	Section of building site
	14.00 - 14.30	LUNCH	
(2 Scene 4)	14.30 - 15.30	Worker representative - Jacob	Office
(2 Scene 7)	15.30 - 17.00	Worker representative Works Council	

	Period of time	Actor requirements	Location requirements
DAY 5 Building site			
(2 Scene 6)	10.00 - 12.00	Manager Foreman Supervisor Worker representative Jacob	Manager's office
(1 Scene 7)	12.30 - 14.00	Management team Worker's delegation	Boardroom (Manager's office)
	14.00 - 15.00	LUNCH	
	15.00 - 16.00	Set up and light locker room (1 Scene 2)	
	16.00 - 17.00	Shoot locker room Sam 10 Labourers	Locker room

APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW PREAMBLE : MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS
(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO AFRIKAANS)

Good morning. I am (name) and I come from the Institute for Personnel Research. The Institute does research on work and workers. Today I will be showing you and some of your colleagues a film about a building site. I will be asking you questions before and after you see the film, to help us determine the best way we can use this film.

I will write down the answers you give me, but not your name, so that your responses will remain completely anonymous and confidential. I shall use the information I get from you and your colleagues to write a general report on the film, which will not refer to any individual names or building sites.

Are there any questions?

People who are taking part in this study have been chosen randomly, and not for any reason to do with your work. After the film, you will be give an opportunity to comment, and ask any further questions you may have.

PREFILM INTERVIEW: MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO AFRIKAANS)

1. Please can you describe your job to me.

2. What industrial/labour relations procedures are used in your firm? _____

(If no mention of worker representation bodies, ask:/ Are workers represented by Works Councils or Trade Unions? Do these represent the black and white workers?

3. Have you received any training in how to deal with workers? Such as

- ☐ supervisory training
- ☐ interpersonal relations
- ☐ conflict handling
- ☐ industrial relations procedures
- ☐ negotiation
- ☐ strike handling
- ☐ grievance + disciplinary procedures

4. Is your contact with black site workers direct or indirect?

- ☐ give instructions directly
- ☐ give instructions via supervisors
- ☐ give no instructions to site workers

5. a. Have you participated directly in industrial relations procedures?

- ☐ grievance procedures
- ☐ disciplinary procedures
- ☐ other (specify

b. Have you participated in any industrial relations negotiations?

c. Have you ever been involved in a strike?

6. a. What are the characteristics of a good supervisor?

b. What are the characteristics of a bad supervisor?

c. What are some of the differences between good and bad supervisors? What about experience, ability to communicate, language group, age, race, knowledge of vernacular.

(If the issue of English /Afrikaans differences has not arisen spontaneously, probe covertly for this).

7.a) What action would you take if there was a fight between a supervisor and a worker?

b) What action should management take if there is a fight between a supervisor and a worker?

8.a) How would you deal with a strike?

b) What action should management take in the event of a strike?

POST-FILM INTERVIEW : REACTION TO FILM MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO AFRIKAANS)

1. What did you think of the film

   _____

   (Probe)?

2. What will you particularly remember about this film? Why?

3.a) Do you remember Sam in the film?

☐ yes

☐ no

Who was he?

_____

(Explain if interviewee does not remember).

What did you think about him?

3.b) Do you remember Rautenbach?

Who was he?

_____

(Explain if interviewee does not remember)

What did you think about him?

3.c) Do you remember Van Wyk?

Who was he?

_____

(Explain if interviewee does not remember)

What did you think about him?

3.d) Do you remember Lucas?

Who was he?

_____

(Explain if interviewee does not remember)

What did you think about him?

3.e) Did you feel that you are like any one of the people in the film?

Which one?

Why?

4. a. If this film were shown to everyone working at your firm, would it have any effect?

b. What effect?

c. Why?

POST-FILM INTERVIEW: INFORMATION GAINED FROM FILM

MANAGERS AND SUPVISORS

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO AFRIKAANS)

5.a) What have you learned from this film?

b) What have you learned about black workers?

6. What have you have learned about industrial relations procedures?

(Probe for a) details of procedures
b) use and value of procedures)

7. What do you think the consequences would be of the way Sam's grievance was handled at the end of the film?

(Focus on the grievance procedure leading to an investigation by management, with Sam, and supervisor present).

Why?

(Probe reasons)

8. Would the film be helpful as part of an industrial relations or supervisory course?

Why/Why not?

9. Do you think seeing this film will help you in dealing with conflict or worker grievances in the future?

10. What did the film tell you about interpersonal relationships on the job?

11. Do you think the film was true to life?

Why?/Why not?

12. Can you suggest ways in which this film could be improved?

13. Do you have any further questions or comments?

APPENDIX 5

INTERVIEW PREAMBLE : WORKERS
(TRANSLATED INTO ZULU AND SOTHO)

Good morning/afternoon. I am (name) . I come from the Institute for Personnel Research, where we do research on workers and the problems of people at work. We are here today to show you a film, and ask you some questions about your work. First I will ask some questions, then you will see the film, then I will ask some more questions about the film. Do you have any questions about who I am?

I shall write down you answers here, (show answer sheet) but I shall not write down your name, so no-one will know who said what. These answer sheets will not be shown to your manager or anybody else in your firm. I will take them back to my office and write a general report with no reference to particular people or building sites. Do you understand?

You are not here because of any problem in your work. I told your management I wanted to see what some workers thought about this, and so they sent people to me. Is this clear?

Are there any further questions?

PRE-FILM INTERVIEW; REPEATED POST-FILM:

(TRANSLATED INTO ZULU AND SOTHO)

Note: These questions are for the guidance of the interviewer and are not necessarily presented as written.

1. What would you do if you were unfairly treated at work? (For example: swearing, physical abuse, unfairly accused of something). Can you give some examples fo what you would do? What about the other types of unfair treatment? What else would you do? (Probe until topic is exhausted)

2. What can workers do if they are unfairly treated at work? Can you give me some examples? Can you think of some other types of unfair treatment? What else could workers do? (Probe until topic is exhausted)

3.a) What makes a bad supervisor?

b) What makes a good supervisor?

(Probes)

What are differences between good and bad supervisors? *Are they things like patience, ability to explain things, age, experience, knowledge of vernacular, language group, race? *(If the English/Afrikaans issue has not arisen spontaneously, this should be covertly probed)

4. How do you think management sees workers in your firm?

(Probes)

- ☐ as units of production
- ☐ respects their dignity
- ☐ treats fairly
- ☐ responds to their needs
- ☐ other (specify)

5. How would your management deal with bad relations with supervisors?

6. How would your management handle a strike?

POST-FILM INTERVIEW: REACTION TO FILM: WORKERS

(TRANSLATED INTO ZULU AND SOTHO)

1. What did you think of the film? (Probe)

2. What will you particularly remember about this film? Why?

3.(i) Do you remember Sam in the film?

Who was he? (Explain if interviewee does not remember)
What did you think about him?

(ii) Do remember Rautenbach?
Who was he? (Explain)
What did you think about him?

(iii) Do you remember Van Wyk?
Who was he? (Explain)
What did you think about him?

(iv) Do you remember Jacob?
Who was he? (Explain)
What did you think about him?

(v) Did you feel that you are like any one of the people in the film?
Which one?
Why?

4. If this film were shown to everyone working at your firm, would it have any effect?

What effect?

Why?

POST-FILM INTERVIEW: INFORMATION GAINED FROM FILM: WORKERS

5. What would you do if you were unfairly treated at work?
Give concrete examples, and details
What else? (Probe)

6. What can workers do generally if they are unfairly treated?
Give some more concrete examples?
What else can they do? (Probe)

7. What makes a bad supervisor?
What makes a good supervisor?
What are the differences between good and bad supervisors?
Are differences to do with things like patience, careful explanations, race, age, experience, language group, knowledge of vernacular? (Probe, covertly for signficance of English/Afrikaans difference)

8. How do you think management sees workers in your firm?

- ☐ as units of production
- ☐ respects their dignity
- ☐ treats fairly
- ☐ responds to their needs
- ☐ other (specify)

9.a) How would your management deal with bad relations with supervisors?

9.b) How could management deal with bad relations with supervisors?

10.(i) What did this film show about how people work together on the job?

(ii) What about supervisors and workers?

(iii) What about management and workers?

(iv) What about workers and workers?

11. Do you think this film showed a real work situation?
Why/why not?
What aspects were real,
What aspects were not real?

12. Do you have any further questions, or comments about the film?

APPENDIX 6

GROUP DISCUSSION INTRODUCTION : WORKERS

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO ZULU AND SOTHO)

Good morning/afternoon. I am (name) and this is (introduce co-workers). We are both from the Institute for Personnel Research, where we do research on workers and the problems of people at work. We are here today to show a film, and then ask you what you feel and think about what happens in that film. First I will show the film, and the we will discuss it together.

You are not here because of any problem in your work. I told your management I wanted some workers who could discuss this film, and they sent you to me. Nobody else will know what you say to me, and I shall not write down your names. I will go back to my office and write a general report which does not mention names or building sites. Do you understand this?

Are there any questions?

After film, when workers are ready for discussion.

Now we will discuss what we have seen. Please say just what you think, don't be afraid to put forward a different view or disagree with someone. Remember, nobody else will know what you have said.

I would like to ask your permission to use this machine to record what has been said, in case I forget things. (Demonstrate recorder. Allow participants to say things, and play back). Will this be alright? (Name of co-worker) will also take notes, but sometimes people forget or make mistakes, and the tape will help us remember. There are no names on the tape.

Any there any questions?

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO ZULU/SOTHO)

1. What did you think of the film? Why?

2. Could such a situation have occurred on sites with which you have had contact. Why?

3. What did you think of the people in the film - Sam, Van Wyk, Rautenbach, Jacob. (Explain who they were, if necessary). Have you ever met people like these? Did you feel that any of these people was like you yourself?

4. Could this film be useful in training supervisors?
Why?
In training workers? Why?
In training management? Why?

5. If this film were used in training, what do you think it would teach people?

6. If you could change any part of this film, what would you change.

GROUP DISCUSSION INTRODUCTION : TRAINERS

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO AFRIKAANS)

Good morning. I am (name) and this is (introduce co-workers). We are both from the Institute for Personnel Research, where we do research relating to work and workers. We have produced a training film on industrial relations, and as you yourselves are experienced trainers we would greatly appreciate your comments.

All comments will of course be both anonymous and confidential. We shall be writing a general report on reactions to this film, with no specific references to individuals or places.

Are there any questions?

After film

Now I would like you to discuss this film. Would you have any objection to my recording the discussion on a tape recorder? It makes it easier for me to simply concentrate on what you say. (Name) will also be taking notes, to enable me to get the fullest possible picture.

Any questions before we begin?

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION

(ALSO TRANSLATED INTO ZULU/SOTHO)

1. What did you think of the film? Why?

2. Could such a situation have occurred on sites where you have worked (For trainees: on sites with which you have had contact. Why?

3. What did you think of the people in the film - Sam, Van Wyk, Rautenbach, Jacob. (Explain who they were, if necessary). Have you ever met people like these? Did you feel that any of these people was like you yourself?

4. Could this film be useful in training supervisors?
Why?
In training workers? Why?
In training management? Why?

5. If this film were used in training, what do you think it would teach people?

6. If you could change any part of this film, what would you change.

APPENDIX 7

TITLE LIST FOR "INDABA YE GRIEVANCE"

1) Main title:

INDABA YE GRIEVANCE

2) End Credits:

This film was sponsored by the
Building Industries Federation of South Africa
and the Federated Life Assurance Company Ltd.

Grateful thanks expressed to:
Murray & Roberts Construction Ltd for their co-operation
and the use of construction site and staff;

BIFSA Training College (Springs) for their co-operation
and use of facilities and staff;

South African Transport Services for their assistance and use
of Railways facilities.

Dr G K Nelson
Executive Director NIPR (HSRC), and
Mr L E Davis
Executive Director BIFSA
for support and assistance;

The Training Division of the NIPR (HSRC)
and Professor K Tomaselli, Director, Contemporary Cultural
Studies Unit, University of Natal
for substantial advice and comments.

All incidents and the behaviour of participants portrayed
were created for the purpose of the film and all names
and situations are fictitious.

Title List for production "Grievance" cont:

Research and Script
Richard S Hall
Head: Industrial Relations Group NIPR (HSRC)

Narrator
Same Williams

Runner
Mark Hinschcliff

Sound Recordist
Shaun Murdoch
Final Mix
Eddie Pearse

Assistant Cameraman
Dirk Mostert

Assistant Director
Jacob Mobolol

Production Manager
Diana Hyslop

Lighting Cameraman
Peter Tischhauser

Written, Edited and Directed by
Kevin Harris

Produced for the NIPR (HSRC) BY
Kevin Harris
c 1985

UHLA LWEZIHLOKO ZABAFANELE BABONGWE EKWENZENI UMBHALO WEFILM : "GRIEVANCE" - INGXENYE YESINGISI

1. ISIHLOKO ESIKHULU (Caption card)
INDABA YEGRIEVANCE (YESIKHALO)

2. ABABONGWA EKUGCINENI (Roller caption)

Lelifilimu ligqugquzelwe ngokuhlanganyela yiBuilding Industries Federation yase South Africa kanye neFederated Life Assurance Company Ltd.

Sibonga kakhulu ku :
Murray & Roberts Construction Ltd ngokubambisana kwabo nathi kanye nokusebenzisa indawo yabo yokwakha kanye nabasebenzi babo.

B.I.F.S.A. Training College (Springs) ngosizo lwabo kanye nokuvuma sisebenzise izinto zabo kanye nestaff;

Dr. G.K. Nelson
Executive Director N.I.P.R. (H.S.R.C.) kanye no-Mr L.E. Davis
Executive Director B.I.F.S.A. ngosizo lwabo;

The Training Division ye N.I.P.R.(H.S.R.C.) noProfessor K. Tomaselli : Director we Contemporary Cultural Studies Unit University yaseNatal, eThekwini ngeseluleko sakhe esiqatha kanye namakhomenti akhe;

South African Transport Services ngosizo lwabo nangokusebenzisa izinto nezidingo ze South African Railways.

Zonke izehlakalo nangendlela abalingiswa abenza ngayo nabavezwe ngayo zenziwelwe kuphela ukuze zihambisane nalefilimu kanti futhi wonke amagama nezimo ezikhona kulefilimu ngeziqanjiweyo.

Ukucwaninga neSkripthi
Richard S. Hall
Umphathi: Industrial Relations Group N.I.P.R. (H.S.R.C.)

Umlandisi
Sam Williams

i-Runner
Mark Hinschcliff

Umqophi womsindo
Shaun Murdoch

Umdidiyeli
Eddie Pearse

Umsizi womthwebuli
Dirk Mostert

Umsizi woMqondisi
Jacob Mamabolo

Umhleli
Diana Hyslop

Ugesi
Peter Tischhauser

Libhalwe, lahlelwa laqondiswa ngu
Kevin Harris

Lenziwelwe iN.I.P.R. (H.S.R.C.) ngu
Kevin Harris
(c) 1985

HSRC PUBLICATION LIST

A complete list of HSRC publications or a list of publications of a particular Institute of the HSRC is available from the Head: Technical Services

RAAD VIR GEESTESWETENSKAPLIKE NAVORSING
HUMAN SCIENCES RESEARCH COUNCIL

President	Dr. J.G. Garbers	President
Adjunk-president	Dr. J.D. Venter	Deputy President
Vise-presidente	Dr. H.C. Marais, Prof. D.J. Stoker	Vice-Presidents
Hoofdirekteur: Administrasie	J.G.G. Gräbe	Chief Director: Administration
Skakelhoof	Dr. M.J. Bekker	Chief PRO

Funksies van die RGN

Die RGN onderneem, bevorder, ondersteun en koördineer navorsing op die gebied van die geesteswetenskappe, bepaal navorsingsprioriteite, versprei die resultate van geesteswetenskaplike navorsing, vergemaklik en evalueer die implementering van die resultate van navorsing, stimuleer die opleiding van navorsers, stel die volle spektrum van dissiplines in die geesteswetenskappe ten diens van die inwoners van die RSA en bevorder die wetenskap in die breë.

Functions of the HSRC

The HSRC undertakes, promotes, supports and co-ordinates research in the field of the human sciences. It also determines research priorities, disseminates the findings of human sciences research, facilitate and evaluates the implementation of research findings, stimulates the training of researchers, places the full spectrum of human sciences disciplines at the service of the inhabitants of the RSA and promotes science in general.

Institute

Instituut vir Geskiedenisnavorsing (IGN)

Instituut vir Kommunikasienavorsing (IKOMM)

Instituut vir Mannekragnavorsing (IMAN)

Instituut vir Navorsingsontwikkeling (INO)

Instituut vir Opvoedkundige Navorsing (ION)

Nasionale Instituut vir Personeelnavorsing (NIPN)

Instituut vir Psigologiese en Edumetriese Navorsing (IPEN)

Instituut vir Sosiologiese en Demografiese Navorsing (ISODEM)

Instituut vir Statistiese Navorsing (ISN)

Instituut vir Taal- en Kunstenavorsing (INTAK)

Buro vir Ondersteunende Navorsingsdienste (BOND)

Administrasie

Institutes

Institute for Communication Research (ICOMM)

Institute for Educational Research (IER)

Institute for Historical Research (IHR)

Institute for Manpower Research (IMAN)

National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR)

Institute for Psychological and Edumetric Research (IPER)

Institute for Research Development (IRD)

Institute for Research into Language and the Arts (IRLA)

Institute for Sociological and Demographic Research (ISODEM)

Institute for Statistical Research (ISR)

Bureau for Research Support Services (BRSS)

Administration

Hoofkantoor
Privaatsak X41, Pretoria 0001
Republiek van Suid-Afrika
Telegramme RAGEN
Tel. (012) 28-3944
Teleks 3-0893

NIPN
Posbus 32410, Braamfontein 2017
Republiek van Suid-Afrika
Telegramme NAVORSPERS
Tel. (011) 339-4451
Teleks 4-25459

Streekkantore
Wes-Kaap, Privaatsak X40, Parow 7500
Tel. (021) 930-2566

Natal, Posbus 508, Durban 4000
Tel. (031) 31-6926

NIPN Natal, Posbus 17001, Congella 4013
Tel. (031) 25-5531

NIPN Oos-Kaap, Posbus 1124, Port Elizabeth 6000
Tel. (041) 53-2131

Head office
Private Bag X41, Pretoria 0001
Republic of South Africa
Telegrams RAGEN
Tel. (012) 28-3944
Telex 3-0893

NIPR
P.O. Box 32410, Braamfontein 2017
Republic of South Africa
Telegrams NAVORSPERS
Tel. (011) 339-4451
Telex 4-25459

Regional offices
Western Cape, Private Bag X40, Parow 7500
Tel. (021) 930-2566

Natal, P.O. Box 508, Durban 4000
Tel. (031) 31-6926

NIPR Natal, P.O. Box 17001, Congella 4013
Tel. (031) 25-5531

NIPR Eastern Cape, P.O. Box 1124, Port Elizabeth 6000
Tel. (041) 53-2131

BEST COPY AVAILABLE